

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, April, 1899.

THE SIXTEENTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.

THE acceptance of the invitation extended by the authorities of the University of Virginia, to hold the sixteenth annual convention of the Modern Language Association of America in Charlottesville, was most fortunate. The growth of interest in linguistic and literary studies on the field of Modern Languages has nowhere been more active than in the Southern States, and in the development of scholarship and the creation of literary taste in that part of the Union the University of Virginia has been the chief factor.

It was, therefore, peculiarly appropriate that the members of the Association should have an opportunity, in the yearly wandering from one part of the country to the other, to visit the great southern University.

The comparative remoteness of location and the fact that there were few of the facilities of a great city did not interfere materially with the success of the meeting, nor with the excellent entertainment, which was afforded the delegates. In round numbers a hundred members were present, representing all the great Eastern universities and colleges. As was to be expected, there was a considerable representation from the southern colleges, especially from those located in Virginia. Harvard, Yale, and Columbia sent large delegations, while the University of Pennsylvania and Johns Hopkins were well represented.

Dr. Paul B. Barringer, the eminent Physiologist, and Chairman of the faculty of the University of Virginia, presided at the opening meeting, which was held Tuesday evening, Dec. twenty-seventh, in Public Hall. Mr. George W. Miles, Head Master of St. Alban's School, and a member of the Board of Visitors, made an eloquent address, in which he welcomed the Association, on the part of the Board, to the University. Professor James W. Bright, responded very happily to the oration of Mr.

Miles and, on behalf of the Association, returned thanks for the cordial welcome.

After these preliminary exercises the President of the Association, Professor Alcée Fortier of Tulane University, delivered the President's address, on the subject of "Social and Historical Forces in French Literature." President Fortier spoke in part as follows:

Philology, in its broadest sense, is understood to signify the study of literature as well as of language; it means, in reality, the study of civilization. The civilization of each country of Western Europe is somewhat different from that of the others, and the literature, which is in great part the product of a peculiar civilization, has peculiar and distinct traits. As civilization means development, new historical and social forces are constantly being brought to bear upon the individual, and the three great causes which mold the mind of the individual are: 1, the fact of being a man, which gives him ideas and sentiments common to all men; 2, his birth-place, which impresses upon him the civilization of his country; 3, the historical and social forces produced in his own life-time.

It is very difficult to trace all the forces which have exerted an influence on French literature, but it is interesting to note some of the most important, from the earliest times to our own epoch. The theories of M. Brunetière and M. Lanson are interesting and important, but they should not be adopted blindly.

The pessimism in contemporary French literature is to be regretted. If French society be taken as a whole we find a happy and prosperous people and no cause for pessimism in literature. Let us hope that pessimism is about to disappear, and that M. Rostand's "Cyrano de Bergerac" is the beginning of a new era and has brought back absolute faith in pure and chivalric sentiments.

At the conclusion of this paper the regular programme of the meeting was begun. Two essays were on the programme for Tuesday evening, one by Dr. P. B. Marcou, entitled "Are French Poets Poetical?" and the other by Prof. Thomas Fitz-Hugh, "A Neglected Field in American Philology."

In answering the query, "Are French poets poetical?" Dr. Marcou said:

Byron, Emerson and Heine have expressed the opinion that there is no real French poetry. Tennyson's favorite French poet is Béranger.

The reasons for this state of things are:—

First:—The rhythm of French poetry, like

the French stress-accent, is so slightly marked that it fails to stir the English or German reader, except where the lines are short and the false foreign rhythm can be easily read into the French lines.

Second:—The slight emotional value of most of the English words that are derived from French and Latin makes French verse seem light and flimsy to the English reader.

Third:—The artificiality of French verse during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries has prejudiced foreign readers against French poetry as a whole.

The best modern French verse is free from the defects that can be urged against the classic French poets, and if a French poet of genius should be born, he would find a perfect instrument awaiting him.

Prof. Fitz-Hugh dwelt pointedly upon the vastly enhanced culture-historical and linguistic significance attaching to the study of the so-called Vulgar Latin in the light of the modern investigations of Gröber, Meyer-Lübke, Wölfflin and their co-adjutors. To the Roman commonfolk *per se*, and not to its aristocratic brother of the Græcizing Classic hierarchy, belongs all the characteristic significance of the Roman spirit in the economy of world-history. The very genius of the Classic Roman world has its living roots in that shrewd practicality and deft eclecticism which are indigenous traits in Roman folk-psychology. On the other hand, if we would search aright for the genius that could take on the new spirit of Christ as promptly as it could put off the old Adam of Hellas, and so as if by world-regeneration reconstitute the foundations of history 'And be the fair beginning of a time,' we must search for it in the living, not the dead Rome, in the mighty race who have spoken since the dawn of history and still speak the *lingua Romana*, and not in the secluded hierarchy, which created and maintained during its political existence the more conservative and stereotyped speech of literature, the *lingua Latina* of scholastic tradition. The study of the spiritual and linguistic life of the Roman commonfolk has, until recently, fallen between the Scylla of Ciceronianism and the Charybdis of Romanic dialecticism. The Classicist scorns it, and the Romanicist neglects it. University catalogues offer courses in the folk-speech, but the scientific work of our Professors is confined to the Classic Latin on the one hand, and the Romanic dialects on the other. The bibliography of the Vulgar Latin is a reproach to American and English scholarship. The author urged a radical change of front in American philology, insisting upon what he called the forward view-point as against the traditional backward view. Instead of eyes directed stolidly back against the increasingly narrow prison-walls of the over and gone, philology

must soon, under the victorious promptings of culture-historical life, enter upon the far vaster, richer and more hopeful regions of the forward view. The increasingly narrow field of Latin Classicism will be widened into the promised land of Latin Romanicism. The borders of Latin philology will be boldly enlarged to enclose the rich virgin soil of the Late Latin, fascinatingly interspersed as it is with the fountain-heads of the Romanic vernaculars. The author urged a readjustment of the time-honored Doctor-trilogy, declaring that the Greek-Latin major is not a logical unit but a duality, having historical, not scientific validity. Not so the Latin-Romanic *Hauptfach*: Latin-Romanic philology is a culture-historical unit. The truly scientific adjustment of the academic trilogy would accordingly be, Latin-Romanic as *Hauptfach*; Greek as *Nebenfach*, and Philosophy as rounder-up; or again, Greek-Romanic as *Hauptfach*, Latin as *Nebenfach*, and the time-honored Philosophy, if you please, as in Germany.

The *lingua Romana* and its most fundamental laws of evolution were characterized in the light of modern investigation, and the field of inquiry was organized by the author in accordance with the trend of the materials collected and proposed as the basis for subsequent papers before the Association.

At the close of Prof. Fitz-Hugh's paper, the meeting adjourned and the delegates attended in a body a reception tendered the Association in the library of the University.

On reassembling, Wednesday morning, the order of business included the further reading and discussion of papers and the reports of the Secretary and Treasurer, which showed the Association to be in a highly flourishing condition.

Prof. Todd's paper, which was the first of the session, entitled "*La Vie de Sainte Catherine d'Alexandrie*," as contained in the Paris MS. *La Clayette*," began with a reference to what has already been published concerning the legend of St. Catherine in general, and an account of the *Clayette* manuscript, which offers a poetical version of the legend, not yet edited, nor even analyzed. The bulk of the paper, as read, presented a popular discussion of the contents of the poem, but as published will consist chiefly of a critically edited reproduction of the original text.

Luis de León, the Spanish poet, humanist and mystic was treated in an article read by Dr. J. D. M. Ford.

The chief purpose of this paper was to call attention to the need felt by students of Spanish

letters of a new and critical edition of the works, and especially the poetical works, of the sixteenth century poet and scholar, Luis de León. The importance of León was indicated: 1. by the citation of eulogistic judgments passed upon him by Cervantes and Lope de Vega; 2. by mention of the fact that Quevedo was the first to publish an edition of his lyrics, and did so to counteract the evil results of the Gongoristic movement, and that Diego González, Cabanyes and Juan Valera have all undergone his influence; 3. and by a rapid account of his life and work. Particular stress was laid upon the humanistic side of the man and his advocacy of the doctrine of *measure*, derived from his study of the Greek and Latin classics. This devotion to *measure* greatly tempered his mysticism which is, therefore, free from the exaggeration by which that quality is so often accompanied in Spanish character, and which has been aptly described by Pérez Galdós in his novel *Halma*.

Prof. M. D. Learned's subject was "German-American Ballads."

The early German settlers in America, though exchanging oppression and poverty for freedom and plenty, in coming to the New World lost, nevertheless, their cultural birthright, and with it among other things the folksong. Among the "Phamer sects" nothing remains of the beautiful choral, for example, but the rough harsh hymn, and the ballad is extinct. Among the Lutherans, on the contrary, there are still fugitive survivals of the German Volkslied.

The following ballads have been found with complete texts in most cases, and in some cases with the music: 1. *Des bucklich Mänli*; 2. *Schpinn, Schpinn mei liebe Tochter*; 3. *In Polen schlecht ein Haus*; 4. *Ulalei*; 5. *In Uniontown*; 6. *Ich war ein kleiner Dittel-am*; 7. *Froh will ich sein*; 8. *Bis die Mühlstein tragen Regen*; 9. *Nau Bill, Ich will dir ebbes froge*; 10. *Ich hab geträumt die anner Nacht*.

The first two songs were compared with the European versions, and it was found that the American versions show a fusion and expansion of the German originals, but of those German versions coming from Alsatian. This accords with the ethnographic traditions of the Germans of Pennsylvania, who came largely from the Rhenish Palatinate and Alsatia. The music of the American ballads has in some cases a different melody from that of the German versions.

Prof. James M. Garnett's paper on "The Latin and the Anglo-Saxon *Juliana*" discussed the two Latin 'Lives' in the *Acta Sanctorum*, and the Greek "Life" in the works of Symeon Metaphrastes (Migne's *Patr. Græca*); the gradual growth of the Martyrologies, as the Martyr. Rom., that attributed to St. Jerome, those of Bede, Ado, and Usuard (Migne's *Patr. Lat.*);

the rise of false "lives" of saints in the seventh century (*Les Vies des Saintes*), such as the first "Life" of St. Juliana in the *Acta Sanctorum*, from which the second "Life" by a certain Peter is derived. Bede, and later Cynewulf, must have had access to such a "Life"; Cynewulf's *Juliana* is directly based on it. An appendix to the paper gives a close comparison of the two. The *Legenda Aurea*, in which the particulars are much condensed, is the source of most of the M. E. "Lives," of all except the earliest ones.

The next paper was by Prof. O. F. Emerson, who treated "Transverse Alliteration in Teutonic Poetry."

Transverse alliteration has been discussed since Lachmann's time, early critics recognizing the phenomenon as an art form of Teutonic poetry. More recently, Frucht (*Metrisches und Sprachliches zu Cynewulf's Elene, Juliana, und Crist*), followed by Sievers (*Allgermanische Metrik*), tried to prove the accidental character of this alliterative form by applying the doctrine of mathematical probability. Frucht's reasoning, however, is faulty on its mathematical basis, since: 1. he did not calculate the chances for vowel and consonant recurrence separately; 2. he did not take account of the much greater frequency of certain initials than of others. Far worse, the doctrine of probabilities is proved wholly inapplicable to the problem, since it utterly fails when tested outside of the special problem to which Frucht applied it.

Prof. George B. Raymond, in his paper on "Modern Poetry and the Revival of Interest in Byron," after referring to the new editions of Byron, called attention to the fact that the novel has largely taken the place in public interest formerly occupied by poetry. The writer noted further the lack of appreciation for the poetry of Tennyson, and of writers influenced by him, on the part of many English-speaking people, and of virtually all foreign critics of distinction.

Prof. Raymond said that the feature that separated verse of this school from that preceding it, was the greater attention given to the musical flow of the syllables—a feature imparting to modern English poetry almost as distinctive a character as the rhythmical balance of lines imparted to the poetry of the age of Pope.

Byron's poetry with its abrupt, if not ungrammatical transitions of tense, its inaccuracies of diction, and its inharmonious succession of syllables, the German critics prefer to the poetry of Tennyson. If we, ourselves, do not prefer it, would it not be wise for us to try to perceive why others should do so, and to ask

ourselves whether this style does not meet a legitimate imaginative demand, which the poetry of our time is neglecting?

After the paper by Prof. Raymond, the meeting adjourned and the Association was for the second time the guest of the University, on this occasion at a luncheon which was served in the library.

Upon reassembling, in the afternoon, the regular order of business was resumed, which included principally the reading of papers. Dr. John R. Effinger was the first on the programme, and read a part of a study of "Lemercier and the Three Unities."

The subject of this paper was to show the views held by Lemercier regarding the application of the famous rules for the three dramatic unities. In his day, during the keen discussion between the Classic and Romantic schools, it was the custom to accept these rules or reject them, unconditionally. This Lemercier did not do, as he consistently held the middle-ground position, now generally accepted, which admits the essential truth of the unities, while approving all deviations which may be required by the nature of the subject in hand. Lemercier was then an early precursor of the modern idea, and not a timid innovator in secret sympathy with the Romantic movement, as has been so often said.

Dr. R. H. Wilson's paper on "Adversative-Conjunctive," relations will be published in a later number of MOD. LANG. NOTES.

Dr. Thomas S. Baker, in treating the sources of Opitz's *Buch von der deutschen Poeterei*, showed to what extent the study of Opitz's models had been carried. There can be no doubt that many authors have been held responsible for Opitz's utterances with whom the German writer was entirely unfamiliar. Several instances were noted where it was manifestly impossible that Opitz could have had access to the works from which it is claimed he borrowed *in extenso*.

Prof. A. Gudeman, then, in an extremely interesting essay, offered a new explanation of "The Origin and Meaning of the Word 'Germani' (Tac. *Germ.* 2)." Prof. Gudeman's results have already been published in *Philologos*, and are exciting attention.

Prof. Magill's article on "The International Correspondence" has already been presented to the readers of MOD. LANG. NOTES. Its read-

ing before the Association called forth some discussion, and the President was requested to appoint a Committee to report on the subject at the next meeting of the Association. This Committee consists of Prof. Magill, Miss Clara Wenckebach, Mrs. Thérèse Colin, and Dr. Adolph Rambeau.

Resuming the regular order of business, Mr. Frederick M. Padelford presented an paper on "Old-English Music."

This paper considered certain stringed instruments of Celtic origin which were used by the Old-English people. These instruments were the *timpan*, the *crwth*, and the *rolla*. They were oblong, rounded at the ends, with depressions in the sides. In the earlier forms they were played with the fingers or with a plectrum, in the later forms with a bow. These instruments were identical originally: the Irish *timpan* became the Welsh *crwth*, and the German *rolla* was an outgrowth of the *crwth*.

This paper was an extract from an essay on Old-English Music which forms the Introduction to a monograph on Old-English Musical Terms. This monograph is to appear as the fourth number of the *Bonner Beiträge*.

This paper was the final one read on Wednesday. In the evening Dr. and Mrs. Paul B. Barringer received the members of the Association at their home. This was one of the most interesting features of the Convention, as it afforded the visitors an opportunity to observe the charm of genuine Southern hospitality.

Thursday, Dec. 29th, was the last day of the meeting, and as a result, very much was crowded into its two sessions. One was held in the forenoon, the other in the evening, the afternoon being devoted to an excursion to "Monticello," the home of Thomas Jefferson. This drive was undertaken at the invitation of the members of the local committee, who throughout the whole convention, contributed greatly to its success. The committee was composed of Professors Charles W. Kent, James A. Harrison, and Paul B. Barringer.

The first paper of the morning session treated "The Origin of the Runic Alphabet, and the Explanation of the Peculiar Order of the Runes." The paper, written by Prof. George Hempl and read by the Secretary of the Association, contained the announcement of an important discovery.

Prof. Hempl presented a brief report on the finding of the key to the long-debated question

as to the origin of the Runic alphabet. Suspecting that the order of the runes was a modification of the usual order, caused by displacements due to association of letters that were similar in form or sound, Prof. Hempl found that a few such displacements explain the whole matter, and prove that the Runic alphabet is derived from a Western Greek alphabet of about 600 B. C. *Theta*, *san*, and *psi* were not adopted. The chief displacements are: *a* and *f* (similar in form) exchanged positions; the voiced labial fricative *b* and the labial vowel *u* were similarly confused; original *r* and the *r* that arose out of *z* exchanged places; *l* joined the similar *n*; *e* was associated with the similar *m*; later *n* was placed between *h* and *i*, to which it is intermediate in form; the ligature *ng* thus got the old place of *n*; the velars were grouped with *h*, *g* (through *kg*) becoming *w*. As in the other Western Greek alphabets, confusion arose between *kappa* and the similarly formed *gamma*, the latter driving out the former. *Thorn* is *delta*; *j* is the older Greek form of *i*; *dæg* is the dental fricative out of which *z* grew in the Eastern alphabets (Wimmer is wrong in placing it *after* the *o*). The position of *z* where it stood in Greek, of itself, puts an end to the theory of the Latin origin of the runes. Taylor and Gundermann came much nearer the truth than Wimmer. Contrary to their theories, however, the Germanic shift of consonants was completed when the alphabet was adopted, but the voiced fricatives had not yet become voiced stops. The paper will appear in full as one of the chapters of a volume of Runic Studies that Prof. Hempl expects to issue during the year.

Probably the most important event of the Convention, was the presentation of the report of the Committee of Twelve, which had been appointed in 1896 to consider the position of the Modern Languages (French and German) in Secondary Education.

A brief summary of results arrived at by the Committee, was given by Prof. Thomas, the chairman. The document will soon be published and distributed.

The report of the chairman leads to the supposition that many of the disputed points in Modern Language teaching have been settled, and to the conclusion that the paper will prove to be a most valuable contribution to this much debated question.

Although a number of the delegates had left Charlottesville before the session of Tuesday night, this meeting proved to be one of great interest.

Prof. W. Stuart Symington, Jr., in his paper on

"The Influence of the Return of Spring on the Earliest French Lyric Poetry," remarked that

the influence of spring on the early French lyric was patent to the most casual reader, that Jeanroy had noted this influence on the "Chansons dramatiques" and the refrains, but that it remained for G. Paris to see that most of the lyric poetry of the Middle Ages had its origin in songs of spring. The reader then showed the extent of this influence: how many and what proportion of the romances, chansons dramatiques (or à personnages), pastourelles, aubes, débats and refrains had: a. an introductory allusion to spring; b. a spring setting; c. allusions to known May ceremonies.

The title of the next paper was "From Franklin to Lowell, a century of New England pronunciation."

Prof. Grandgent gave only a brief sketch of certain portions of his paper, which, in its complete form, deals with New England pronunciation—and incidentally with English phonology in general—from the middle of the eighteenth century to the middle of the nineteenth. The first subject treated was the development of untrilled *r*, in the second half of the eighteenth century, and the loss or vocalization of this *r* (unless it precede a vowel) at a somewhat later date. The next topic was the revival of "Italian *a*," in such words as *father*, *hard*, *ask*, which in Franklin's time were pronounced with the vowel of *cat*; the modern sound came into use in the latter part of the eighteenth century. The evolution of the modern value of *u* in *hurt* and *i* in *first* was then discussed. The breaking of "long *a*" and "long *o*," in words like *fate* and *rote*, was shown to be a very recent phenomenon. Finally the diphthongs, "long *i*," *ou*, and *oi*, were taken up, and their different shades of sound were noted. To illustrate the practice of the beginning and the middle of the period treated, and the rustic usage of the first half of our century, Prof. Grandgent read a selection from Addison in accordance with a phonetic transcription by Benjamin Franklin, a little poem from *The Young Ladies' and Gentlemen's Spelling-Book*, with the pronunciation of the last years of the eighteenth century, and the opening speech of *Richard III*, in the dialect of the *Biglow Papers*.

"Some Tendencies in Contemporary English Poetry" were discussed by Mr. Cornelius Weygandt.

A study of the output of English verse since 1888 shows its dominant note to be virility. Five writers have attained a certain distinction during this decade—Mr. W. E. Henley, Mr. Kipling, Mr. John Davidson, Mr. Francis Thompson and Mr. W. B. Yeats. Of these, Mr. Henley,

Mr. Kipling and Mr. Davidson are essentially poets of virility. They are in a sense realists, but they see romance in reality. They believe that the basic passions of men, forming as they do so much of life, call for expression as full, are capable of expression as exalting, as intellectuality, spirituality, dream. Anti-ascetic and optimistic, these three poets have taken to heart Mr. Meredith's declaration that "blood and brain and spirit" joined, fused in the man, are necessary for his true felicity. In the words of their masters—Browning, Whitman, and Mr. Meredith—these three younger men are singing "the wild joys of living," "the procreant rage of the world," "iron hymns." They, as well as their masters, have exerted a very evident influence upon contemporary verse-writers, most of whom show comparatively little influence of Tennyson and the pre-Raphaelites.

Prof. Edwin W. Bowen read the next paper, his subject being "The Development of Long *u* in Modern English."

The subject of this study was to show the historical development in Modern English of long *u*. Beginning with ME. the author showed that the original AS. *u* did not persist, but passed into the ME. diphthong *ou*. The Modern-English long *u* came into ME. from three sources; namely, 1. certain original AS. diphthongs *eu* and *ēu*; 2. certain French *u*'s, which were introduced into English from the Anglo-Norman dialect chiefly; 3. Late ME. close *ō*, which in the seventeenth century developed into long *u*. The early Modern-English long *u*, which was pronounced almost like the Modern-French *ū*, persisted to the eighteenth century, when it passed into the diphthong *iu* with the stress shifted to the second element. This has continued to the present, but with considerable modifications, giving the variety of the long *u*-sounds of the present day.

The last paper that was read was by Prof. J. L. Hall on "Experiments in Translating Anglo-Saxon Poetry." Two more papers, "The Influence of German Literature in America from 1800 to 1825," by Dr. Frederick H. Wilkens, and "Archaisms in Modern French," by Mrs. Thérèse F. Colin, were read merely by title.

At this session the officers for the ensuing year were elected. The changes consisted in the election of Prof. H. C. G. von Jagemann as President, and of Professors L. E. Menger, H. S. White and W. D. Toy to the Executive Council, to take the places of Professors C. T. Winchester, Bliss Perry, and A. R. Hohlfeld.

The programme of the meeting was excellent throughout, although there seems to be an increasing demand for a larger number of papers

of general interest, and for more discussion of the papers dealing with special topics.

Columbia University, New York, was selected as the place of meeting for the next year. The Secretary of the Association, Prof. Bright, is at present engaged in making arrangements with representatives of other philological societies in the United States, for holding a Philological Congress in the year 1900.

THOMAS STOCKHAM BAKER.

Johns Hopkins University.

THE HOMUNCULUS-HELENA THEORY, AND THE EVOLUTION OF THE HELENA DRAMA AND ITS ANTECEDENTS.

IN the November and December issues of MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. xiii, 1898, Veit Valentin, Professor in Frankfurt on the Main, and member of the Executive Council of the Goethe-Gesellschaft, editor of a number of 'Deutsche Schul-Ausgaben,' and author of a series of 'Ästhetische Schriften,' has an article on 'Goethes Homunkulus,' the object of which is to uphold his Homunculus-Helena Theory against an attack which had been made upon it in MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. xii, 1897, No. 2 (Feb.), and to refute the explanation of Homunculus which was advanced in the same place. Every line of the twenty columns of the article shows how completely Veit Valentin is convinced of the correctness of his theory, and how far superior he considers his method to that of his opponent. Nevertheless, it would have been more fair on his part if he had really examined his opponent's method instead of condemning it without a hearing,¹ and a great deal more

¹ Valentin asserts again and again that in the article in the February issue of MOD. LANG. NOTES for 1897, no attention was paid to the dramatical connection in which Homunculus appears. He might have convinced himself that the greater part of col. 77 and parts of cols. 78 and 79 deal with the relation of Homunculus and the Galatea scene to the second and third acts. The evolution of Homunculus has since been presented in a similar way by Dietze in the *Ztschr. f. d. Phil.* xxx, 2, p. 244 f. and by Thomas: *Goethes Faust*, Vol. ii; Second Part, Boston, 1897. It shall not be maintained that the division of the Classical Walpurgis-Night as given in col. 77 is correct. The Classical Walpurgis-Night is dominated by the contrast of the worlds of the land and of the sea. Its dramatical aspect will be treated more fully in a special article entitled: *The Evolution of the Classical Walpurgis-Night and the Scene in Hades*, which is about to appear in *Americana Germanica*.

wise, if he had carefully investigated the poet's evidence regarding the Helena drama and its antecedents, instead of forcing both the Helena and the Classical Walpurgis-Night into a dramatic structure evolved from his own mind. In the following, first the theory for which Valentin is contending and which he has now published four times² will be restated; then a résumé of the preceding criticism and counter-criticism will be given; and finally a decision will be sought by means of a historical examination of Goethe's own evidence in the case.

The Homunculus-Helena theory is, in short, as follows: Helena and her maids and Mene-laüs and his followers consist of three component parts: the shade which gives them form and personality; life which animates them; and matter which makes them material beings of flesh and blood. The entire second act has the purpose of preparing for the union of those three parts. Homunculus stays in his bottle until the shades of Helena and the others are at hand. Then inspired by the beauty of Galatea he shatters his bottle and unites with the elements. The union of life and matter is at once built into the shades, which until then were empty,³ and transforms them into material bodies of flesh and blood.⁴ These bodies have full reality, but Helena and her maids are at the same time conscious of their artificiality. What formerly was Homunculus is now the life of all those bodies and manifests itself also in Euphorion. When the maid whom Euphorion has caught dissolves, what was Homunculus goes up into the air; when Helena returns to Hades, what was Homunculus remains in her garments which carry Faust aloft; when the maids consider their future, what was Homunculus remaining connected with the matter of the elements is to continue life in "den Verkörperungen der vier Elemente,"⁵ in ever new

forms. Only with this assumption, it is claimed, Homunculus has a dramatic purpose, only so the appearance of Helena can be understood dramatically, only so the "grosse Lücke" between the second and third acts is filled out.⁶

The manner in which Helena receives her corporeal being, says Valentin, undergoes the following changes. According to the oldest designs it was through a magic ring, according to the *Ankündigung*, of Dec. 17, 1826, it was by means of the sojourn in a certain place (that is, Sparta), according to the final execution of the drama, whatever Valentin may mean by that, it was through a spiritual force (that is, Homunculus).⁷

In the article in the issue of February, 1897, the attempt was made to show the untenability of this theory mainly by trying to prove, on the one hand, that Helena and her maids have no material bodies of flesh and blood and hence have no need of Homunculus, and on the other hand, that Homunculus is obliged to take the road of evolution and, thereby, is debarred from uniting with the shades of Helena and her maids. Besides, the fact was emphasized that no one before Valentin had ever thought of such a combination of Homunculus and Helena, and that Goethe himself had nowhere given the slightest hint that he intended so strange a device.

Of these points, only the first has been combatted by Valentin with evidence from Goethe which, however, as the reader may see in the note below,⁸ is not conclusive. The second is simply denied on the strength of the theory which ought first to be proved,⁹ and the third is headed off by a wail over the preoccupation of the public with regard to the Second Part of Faust,¹⁰ an argument which may be justified where an allegorical or symbolical interpretation of certain persons or passages is con-

² In the two books mentioned above, in the *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, vol. xvi, and in the issues of MOD. LANG. NOTES cited above.

³ See especially *Erläuterung*, etc., p. 87: "dann entsteht beim Zerschellen der Flasche die Vereinigung der Lebenskraft mit den Elementen und baut sie in die bis dahin leere Gestalt des Schattenbildes als lebendigen Stoff hinein."

⁴ MOD. LANG. NOTES, Vol. xiii, col. 466: "Hier handelt es sich aber . . . um eine materielle, körperliche Wiederbelebung, um eine Erscheinung in Fleisch und Blut, etc."

⁵ *L. c.*, col. 449.

⁶ *L. c.*, col. 464. Valentin seems to have misunderstood a passage in Eckermann's letter to Goethe, Sept. 14, 1830.

⁷ *L. c.*, col. 440, and in the books cited above.

⁸ *L. c.*, col. 438: "durch einen magischen Ring ist ihr die Körperlichkeit wiedergegeben," sage nicht ich, sondern sagt Goethe, etc., and col. 438 f.: "Als wahrhaft lebendig" sagt Goethe—Gerber weiss es besser. As for the first point Helena is called in the same place a "Halbwirklichkeit," a semi-reality. A semi-reality is not a material reality of flesh and blood. For the second point see cols. 210-221 of this article.

⁹ *L. c.*, col. 467.

¹⁰ *L. c.*, cols. 464 and 467.

cerned, but which surely ought to have no weight with regard to the recognition of an important dramatic motif. That would be presuming too much on the prepossession and lack of insight of all readers and critics before himself.

Though it should, therefore, seem that Valentin's theory still stands as much disproved as it appeared to Prof. Poll of Harvard, when he reported in that sense to the *Euphorion*,¹¹ though it might be urged that it is incompatible with Goethe's regard for the eternal laws of nature or with his art as a dramatic poet, though, finally, it might be shown that it does not even explain what it purposes to do, namely, the arrival of Helena in Sparta with the idea that she is coming from Troy, etc., it shall this time be attacked with the aid of evidence from Goethe himself only.

This evidence is found in volume xv, 2, of the Weimar Goethe edition, in the extracts from Goethe's diaries in Erich Schmidt's *Goethes Faust in ursprünglicher Gestalt* and in Eckermann's *Gespräche mit Goethe*, all of which books must undoubtedly have been accessible to Valentin all this time.

In the *Ankündigung* of his *Helena* of Dec. 17, 1826,¹² Goethe tells us that it was the part which Helena plays in the old legend and in the puppet play that induced him not to neglect so important a motif in his own work. In accordance with this statement we see him take from the legend, in his plan of 1775,¹³ not only those traits which are still preserved in the final version, namely, the twofold entrance of Helena, her having a son with Faust and her disappearing simultaneously with that son,¹⁴ but also that it is Mephistopheles who brings her from Orcus, that he takes her to Germany¹⁵ instead of Greece, and that Faust is yet called a new Paris. In other respects the plan of 1775 already differs from the legend,

¹¹ Band v, Heft 2, p. 358 (*l. c.*, col. 468).

¹² Weimar Edition (—W.E.) xv, 2, p. 199 f. Repeated in *Kunst und Alterthum*, Band vi, Heft 1 (1827), p. 202 f.

¹³ W.E. xv, 2, p. 173 ff., more especially 175 f.

¹⁴ In the *Helena* drama, to be sure, there is a slight apparent interval, yet mother and son are still inseparable, Helena exclaiming: 'Persephoneia, nimm den Knaben auf und mich.'

¹⁵ That the castle must be sought in Germany may be inferred from the general situation and the *Paralipomenon*, no. 84, l. 14 (*l. c.*, p. 184).

and foreshadows quite a number of new traits which reappear on a higher plane, and more poetically developed, in the finished drama. Faust has an 'unendliche Sehnsucht nach der einmal erkannten höchsten Schönheit.' Helena is limited to a certain territory. She meets Faust in a castle. He has become a mediæval knight. She is no longer a source of evil to him. Their son dances and sings as soon as he is born. His lack of restraint is his ruin. He dies in connection with a fight. His death severs the union of his parents, and when on parting, Helena throws herself into her husband's arms, he clasps only her empty garments in his embrace.

In one point, however, the plan of 1775 differs both from the legend and the final version, and that is in connecting Helena's and her son's corporeal existence with a magic ring, a device which the legend did not need because in it Helena simply appears and disappears according to mediæval beliefs, and with which the drama could dispense, because in it the revivification of Helena is founded on ancient tradition. But, although in the drama Helena's return to life is no longer connected with the ring, yet obtained through the intercession of Manto, the ring itself does not immediately disappear from Goethe's plans. In a partial scheme,¹⁶ for example, it is still attached to the beginning of Mephistopheles' activity: 'Übergang ins magische Unheimliches Ring' and only gradually it is entirely renounced. Quite a similar gradual renunciation of a motif for which a better and more organic one had been substituted may be observed in the case of the interlocutory¹⁷ in which Phorkyas was to apologize for the rapid growth of Euphorion by a reference to the British stage, where a little child in the course of the action develops into a hero. For after Goethe had hit upon the comparison with Hermes, the interlocutory and the chorus 'Nennst du ein Wunder das?' once appear in the same scheme.¹⁸ In the final version, however, both the ring and the interlocutory are given up.

¹⁶ *Paralip.*, No. 162, l. 7 f.: 'Übergang ins magische Unheimliches Ring.' Cf. also No. 165, l. 17 and No. 166, l. 2.

¹⁷ *Paralip.*, No. 176.

¹⁸ *Paralip.*, No. 166, l. 14: 'Phorkyas interloquirt'—l. 15: 'Nennst du ein Wunder das?'

The new manner of Helena's revivification which could dispense with the magic ring was considered by the poet a matter of great importance. This is proved by the introduction to *Helena* of June 10, 1826.¹⁹ In the first place this introduction was written immediately upon the preliminary completion²⁰ of the drama, and in the second place it explains nothing but the one single thing—how and upon what conditions Helena returns to life. All the other events which now form the first and second acts of the completed Second Part are still left to the imagination. Only in the following half-year, or rather towards the close of it, in the months of November and December, Goethe elaborated a more detailed introduction. The schemes of Nov. 9, and 10(?),²¹ cover the entire second act and give at least a few more hints as to how the events of that act were being planned, while the sketch of four folio pages of Dec. 15,²² and the *Ankündigung* of seven pages of Dec. 17, contain a rather full outline of both the first and second acts as they were then intended.

In the *Ankündigung*, of Dec. 17, where Homunculus still appears with a body and hence even according to Valentin's admission²³ can have nothing whatever to do with Helena, the revivification is still conceived as it was in the introduction of June 10, only the details which were given for the first time in the scheme of Nov. 9, are still further increased so that the whole scene in Hades now occupies forty lines. Manto descends with Faust to Hades and makes a plea for the release of Helena. This

¹⁹ *Paralip.*, No. 123, 2, p. 213 f.

²⁰ Erich Schmidt, *I. c.*, p. 99: '8 Juni. Völliger Abschluss der Helena. Vorbereitung des Mundums.' Besides: '13 Juni. Überlegung noch einiger wirksamer Chöre zur Helena. 24 Juni. Völliger Abschluss der Helena, durch Umschreiben einiger Bogen.' Between this day and January 25, 1827, when the manuscript was packed in order to be sent to Cotta, there is no indication of any consequential change whatsoever, only some filing seems to have been done. The only entry in the diary which indicates such filing is: '21 November. Revidirte an der Helena.' The date of the final completion of the Helena drama is, therefore, June 24, 1826.

²¹ *Paralip.*, No. 99. The scheme of Nov. 9 is in the notes. The date of Nov. 10 appears probable from the diary, *I. c.*, p. 100 '10 November. Das Schema zu Fausts zweytem Theil fortgesetzt.'

²² *Paralip.*, No. 123, 1 in the notes.

²³ *L. c.*, col. 439: 'Auch in diesem Entwurfe Goethes hat Homunkulus mit Helena nichts zu thun.'

plea is based on the strength of precedents. Protesilaus, Alceste, Eurydice had been released; even Helena herself had once before received permission to return to life in order to be wedded to Achilles. The argument is successful. Helena is to return to the upper world upon the condition that she be limited to Sparta, as in the case of Achilles she had been limited to the island of Leuke. She is to appear alive, or 'truly alive' at Sparta, and it is to be left to the new wooer to see how he can win her favor. Her release, therefore, is granted in accordance with the precedents in Greek tradition, and more especially in analogy to her own former return to life in the case of Achilles. Corporeal being is implied in the release and not, as Valentin surmises, obtained by the 'Zaubermittel (!)' of a sojourn in a certain place.

Since this conception of the revivification of Helena, as was shown above, was written after the drama had been completed, it follows that the limitation to Sparta should be interpreted from the drama as we have it. In Goethe's mind a stay in Arcadia must, therefore, not have seemed to conflict with this limitation to Sparta, whether he thought of the fact that parts of Arcadia had belonged to Sparta in history, or whether Helena's sovereignty extended Sparta over Arcadia as well as over the other states of the Peloponnesus, or whether, which would seem most likely, Sparta is to be conceived as a contrast to Germany where Helena, as we saw, was taken in the legend and in the plan of 1775.

Also the much debated question of the nature of Helena's corporeal being can only be considered from the standpoint of the *Ankündigung* in connection with the drama. Helena is to be released from Hades, and is to appear in Sparta 'truly alive.' For a while she distinguishes herself in no manner from a being that is truly alive in the ordinary material sense of the word, but soon the aspect changes both with herself and with her maids. She feels drawn towards Orcus; she is vanishing away and becoming a phantom to herself; her soul is ready to leave the form of all forms upon which the sun has ever shone;²⁴ and when she does depart her corporeal being actually

²⁴ *L. l.* 8836 f., 8881; 8904 ff.

vanishes, without leaving any material trace, in exactly the same manner as in the plan of 1775, where she is called a 'semi-reality.' Her son's rapid birth and development are contrary to all laws of the material world; his death seems to take place in consonance with them, but his corporeal being vanishes at once without leaving a trace. The maids are called phantoms by Mephistopheles; at another time they are doubtful as to whether they are not shades following Hermes' golden staff to Hades; one of their number changes into a flame to tease Euphorion, as the Lamiae transform themselves to make sport of Mephistopheles; all the others, except Panthalis, finally join nature or the elements in their capacity of spirits,²⁵ and the Phantasmagory is ended.

With this wonderful world Faust associates without difficulty. Just as in the *Ankündigung* Chiron, who also according to Valentin's opinion is a phantom, carries him through Thessaly, Helena bears him a son. At the same time he is perfectly conscious that this world is transient, for he says to Helena 'Dasein ist Pflicht und wär's ein Augenblick' and, accordingly, he does not shed a tear nor feel a pang when all is over. Only the uplifting influence of the whole experience remains with him. But can this revived world have more than a poetic reality? Must not any attempt to attribute to it a material reality involve us in the greatest intellectual difficulties, or even lead to such lamentable failures as Valentin's Homunculus-Helena theory?

That this theory is a failure can now easily be seen. Goethe tells us five times, June 10, Nov. 9, and 10(?), Dec. 15 and 17, 1826, the last time in forty lines with all due detail, that he has conceived the revivification of Helena as

²⁵ Ll. 8930; 9116 ff.; 9806 f.; the stage directions read in H. 68: 'Sie verwandelt sich und flammt und lodert;' 9989 ff. Also Eckermann, 29 Jan. 1827: 'Auf den Gedanken, dass der Chor . . . sich den Elementen zuwirft, thue ich mir wirklich etwas zugute.' Notice that the terms: *Idol* (8831), *Seele* (8904), *Gespenster* (8930) and *Geister* (9990) are all used synonymously. In the sketch of Dec. 15 the Pompejans and Caesareans are called *Geister* and *Gespenster* in the same clause (*l. c.*, p. 206). The phantasmagorical character of the third act appears also from l. 22 in the interlocutory of Phorkyas (*l. c.*, p. 234): '*Gespensisch* spinnt der Dichtung Faden sich immer fort.' Ll. 9992-9995 show that the spirits of the maids will 'preside' over the life of the branches. Compare also H. 57 (*l. c.*, p. 129): 'Lass uns dort der Trauben pflegen.' The Phantasmagory now begins at Pharsalus.

taking place in strict analogy to her former return to life in the case of Achilles, and carries this analogy so far as to give her son by the second Achilles, the very name of the one she had by the first and even, in imagination at least, his wings;²⁶ Goethe writes these accounts of her revivification, not before he had composed his drama and when he might still have changed both the drama and its presuppositions, but *after* he had finished the *Helena* and when, therefore, all fundamental alterations in the presuppositions were out of question; Goethe moreover enjoins upon the reader that the revivification and what precedes it should be 'als vorausgehend genau gekannt und gründlich überdacht.' In spite of all this, Valentin has the boldness to replace Goethe's own organic introduction by his fantastic and artificial Homunculus-Helena theory.

And how is his analytic proof in the *Goethe-Jahrbuch*?²⁷ He starts out with the abstract, though not incorrect assumption, that the manner in which Helena and her maids dissolve must contain a clue as to how the poet conceived their coming into life. Then he interprets this dissolution to suit his theory, and thus by sheer force of necessity arrives at that which he set out to prove. One glance at the chronology of the introduction, or the schemes, or the *Ankündigung*, might have shown him that his æsthetic deductions are all in the air and that, Homunculus not being available for Helena and her maids, on the contrary his interpretation of their dissolution must be wrong.

Finally, the so-called historical investigation which Valentin claims to have made,²⁸ and by which he discovered that Helena receives cor-

²⁶ Hederich (Goethe's Mythological Handbook) bearbeitet von J. J. Schwabe, 1770: sub Euphorion: 'ein Sohn des Achilles und der Helena, welcher in den glücklichen Inseln von ihnen erzeugt, u. mit Flügeln geboren wurde.' Mr. A. Strübing of Weimar has had the kindness to look up this reference for me.

²⁷ Band xvi, p. 132:

'Wenn wir einen Organismus in seinem Bestande verstehen lernen wollen, so bleibt nichts Anders übrig als ihn zu zerlegen. . . . Da müssen wir es um so dankbarer begrüßen, wenn uns der Dichter selbst in der Zerlegung unterstützt . . . denn so können wir wenigstens mit Sicherheit erkennen, wie er sich das Ganze gedacht hat. Glücklicherweise ist dies aber auch gerade das, was wir hier suchen.'

Also *l. c.*, col. 440 and *Erläuterung*, p. 104.

²⁸ *l. c.*, col. 434; larger book, p. 153 f.; *Erläuterung*, p. 84.

poreal being first through the magic ring, then by means of the sojourn in Sparta, and in the last place through Homunculus. The first item is actually correct; the second is wrong because, as we have seen above, she was revived in analogy with her return to life for the sake of Achilles; the third is impossible because the time for further changes had expired with the completion of the drama. Hence the revivification through Homunculus which Valentin palms off as a 'geniale Umgestaltung' of Goethe is nothing but a fantastic lucubration of his own brains, the 'Genialität' of which may be left to the judgment of the reader.

That Goethe still adhered to his idea of the revivification of Helena—as of course he was obliged to do because it was the basis of the Helena drama—when the Classical Walpurgis-Night was finished, is proved by the existence of a scheme of June 18, 1830, entitled 'Prolog des dritten Acts'²⁹ which sets a double seal on the final overthrow of Valentin's hypothesis. In the first place, the conditions of Helena's return to life are still the same as they were in 1826; in the second place, the union of Homunculus with the sea is now separated from Helena's release from Hades, not only by the close of a scene, but by the close of an act. Instead of seeing, as Valentin³⁰ wishes him to, the threads that connect Homunculus with Helena, the spectator sees the curtain of the act fall after Homunculus has become wedded to the sea, and when he sees it rise again Manto has not yet even made the request for Helena's release.

That the execution of this prologue was finally abandoned does not alter the case. Two facts remain established by Goethe's own authority. First, that in 1826 he finished the Helena drama without planning that Homunculus should have a share in Helena's revivification, since at that time Homunculus was conceived as having a body from the start, and second, that in 1830 he completed the Classical Walpurgis-Night without intending that the shades of Helena and her maids, and Menelaus and his men, should unite with Homunculus, since, apart from other reasons, Helena was con-

²⁹ *Paralip.*, no. 157.

³⁰ *L. c.*, col. 467 and *Goethe-Jahrbuch*, xvi, p. 143.

ceived as being still in Hades for a good while after Homunculus had been wedded to the sea.

How easily could Valentin have seen all this himself and kept from expending a vast amount of labor and ingenuity on a useless hypothesis, had he not had as profound a disregard for place, in the case of the projected scene in Hades, as he had for time, in the case of the chronology of the *Ankündigung* of the *Helena* and the sketch and schemes preceding it. He might have found in the Weimar edition, which was always at his elbow, and of which he is himself a co-editor, that Goethe states or intimates there in no less than eight different places—in the introduction of June 10, in the schemes of Nov. 9, and 10(?), in the sketch of the *Ankündigung* of Dec. 15, and in the *Ankündigung* itself of Dec. 17 of the year 1826, and in the schemes of Jan. (?), Feb. 6,³¹ and June 18 of 1830,—that Faust's arrival in Hades and the scene in Hades were immediately to precede the Helena drama. But as place is overlooked in his æsthetical deductions just as much as time, he blandly assumes in both of his books, in the *Goethe-Jahrbuch* and in *MOD. LANG. NOTES*, that Helena's shade is present when Homunculus shatters his glass, and calmly maintains that the scene in Hades remained unwritten, because

'die strenge Folgerichtigkeit seiner Entwicklung der Handlung verbot es ihm (Goethe), in die durch Zauber für eine Nacht lebendig gewordene Geisterwelt eine Handlung einzuschalten, die in der mit bleibendem Dasein ausgestatteten natürlichen Wirklichkeit der antiken Götterwelt (Hades) vor sich gehen müsste.'³²

though Goethe never dreamed of *inserting* it, but always intended to put it at the close.

If a writer is so infatuated with a pet theory that he no longer pays attention to the conditions of time and place, as laid down by the poet for whom he professes the greatest admiration, he can hardly be expected to examine without bias the remarks of a critic whom he ranks with the interpreters of a by-gone age. For this reason no attempt will be made to show in detail that the supposed inaccuracies in the article of February, 1897, are all due to misun-

³¹ *Paralip.*, no. 124 and no. 125.

³² *Erläuterung*, p. 97. Compare also the larger book, p. 175 f. The italics are not Valentin's.

derstanding on his part.³³ Nor will it be necessary to re-enter upon a discussion of the question of method, after it has been seen whither the method for which Valentin claims so much has led him. It may, however, be remarked that the fall of the Homunculus-Helena theory does not only discomfit Valentin's dramatic interpretation of the second and third acts, but that it also gives a severe shock to the dramatic fabric which he has constructed for the whole of Faust. Had it not been for the reverent preservation of the documents which show the gradual progress and development of Goethe's work, the Homunculus-Helena theory might have continued for many more years to hold a large proportion of the readers and students of Faust under the magic spell with which the brilliant style and the assurance of its originator have invested it.

ADOLF GERBER.

Earlham College.

A PREPOSITIONAL HITCH.

"Is *on* or *of* right in this place?"

"Well?"

"... the pleasant store of learning that they got when they read to each other *on* winter nights ..."—Do you want to say *on* or *of*?"

"I want to conform to usage."

"That's why I asked," she said.

"In such a place I usually say *on*, if I use a preposition at all."

"*Of* seems more natural to me."

"Perhaps I have something," and I went to a box of mems.—"Here is something, but not much."—Then I marked five quotations, (*a*), (*b*), etc., and laid them on the table one after another, with little pauses between, waiting for comments.

(*a*) "... its quaint, gray, castled city where the bells clash of a Sunday ..."—Robert Louis Stevenson, *The Silverado Squatters*, p. 63.

"I thought so."

³³ As Valentin might have inferred from the absence of quotation marks, it was not intended to give his views literally, but only in substance and much condensed. See also the misunderstandings in the interpretations of the luminosity of the phosphorescent atoms (*l. c.*, col. 439) and of the passage referring to the completion of the Classical Walpurgis-Night (cols. 442 and 443). In the latter place, Valentin adds a learned discourse on Goethe's use of 'ins Unendliche,' without noticing that the passage in question does not contain that expression at all.

(*b*) "... when old Mr. Crewe, the curate ... delivered inaudible sermons on a Sunday ..."—George Eliot, *Scenes of Clerical Life* (Edinburgh, cabinet ed.), vol. ii, p. 51.

"Oh!"

(*c*) "... it was a correct thing to be seen at church of a Sunday ..."—Thackeray, *Pendennis* (London, 1869), vol. ii, ch. ii, p. 18.

"Two to one."

(*d*) "My brother had arrived from Persia only a few hours before. This was on the Tuesday."—J. H. Newnan, *Apologia*, ch. i.

"Oh, that doesn't count. That's different."

(*e*) "When they hear that up at the hall they play tennis on Sunday afternoons."—Augustus Jessopp, *The Trials of a Country Parson* (London, 1890), p. 39.

"One way is just as good as the other," and her eyes turned to the MS. again.

"It's a pity that people who write about good English haven't reached that conclusion in a lot of cases. But, my dear, you got there on too slight support.—In fact, you jumped. When there are only two conclusions to choose from, you are just as likely to be right as not—if you don't care which is which."

"But there were *four* here."

"Prove it."

"(1), (*a*) might be right and (*b*) wrong; (2), (*b*) might be right and (*a*) wrong; (3), (*a*) and (*b*) might both be right; (4), (*a*) and (*b*) might both be wrong,—yes, and (5), (*a*) and (*b*) might be right or wrong according to the way you used them,—and half-a-dozen more, for aught I know."

"Let's go on with the work. Publishers don't care about such things."

"Men's minds are different from women's minds."

"That doesn't fret them."

"Women are right a great deal oftener than men are, and it doesn't take them half so long either."

"There isn't any place for that opinion in this book."—(Men must never doubt the superiority of men.)

Naturally, after that, one got together more examples that would throw light on the prepositional question at issue. Such success as has been reached in stringing them on a discriminative theory is shown below.

When an act or occurrence is *not* thought of as customary, *on* is used (or understood) before

the day, afternoon, evening, etc., on which the act or occurrence is said to have taken place; as, *they were married on a Wednesday; we arrived at Richmond on a rainy Saturday afternoon.*

"It was between three and four o'clock, on a fine morning in August, that, after a ten hours' journey from Frankfort, I awoke at the Weimar station."—George Eliot, *Essays and Leaves from a Note-Book*, 2d. ed. (Edinburgh, 1884), p. 290.

"Some say that he [St. Martin] died on a Sunday, at midnight."—J. H. Newman, *Historical Sketches*, 5th ed. (London, 1885), vol. ii, p. 205.

"Ascend with me on this dazzling Whitsunday the Brocken of North Germany."—De Quincey, *Suspiria de Profundis* (Boston, 1858), p. 247.

"There had been a grand entertainment at Gaunt House on one beautiful evening in June . . ."—Thackeray, *Pendennis* (London, 1869), vol. ii, ch. vii, p. 78.

"On Sunday afternoon I accompanied her to Rydal Mount."—Emerson, *English Traits* (Boston, 1887), ch. xvii, p. 279.

"It was a wood-fire in the parlor of an old farm-house, on an April afternoon, but with the fitful gusts of a wintry snow-storm roaring in the chimney."—Nathaniel Hawthorne, *The Blithedale Romance* (Boston, 1852), ch. ii, p. 14.—"On one of those ugly nights, which we have faintly hinted at . . ."—*Id.*, *The Scarlet Letter* (Boston, 1885), ch. xi, p. 178.

"It was on a Sunday, during the time of public worship, that he was conveyed under a guard to his place of confinement."—Macaulay, *History of England* (London, 1869), vol. iii, ch. x, p. 352.

" . . . he arriv'd at Rome on a Thursday night . . ."—James Howell, *The Signorie of Venice* (London, 1651), p. 138.

To connect *of* with a single act, as in the passage quoted below, is not in accord with the prevailing literary usage of either England or America.

"I remember that in going to England a year ago, and disembarking of a dismal, sleety Sunday evening at Folkstone, the first thing that struck me was the good looks of the railway porters . . . In like manner, landing lately at Boulogne of a brilliant Sunday morning . . ."—Henry James, *Portraits of Places* (Occasional Paris).

But a *customary* act or occurrence is followed sometimes by *on* and sometimes by *of*,—much

oftener by *on* than *of* when the day, afternoon, evening, etc., is named or qualified by a defining word or phrase.

"He gets together the working men in his parish on a Monday evening, and gives them a sort of conversational lecture on useful practical matters . . ."—George Eliot, *Amos Barton*, ch. vi.—"The book Adam most often read on a Sunday morning was his large pictorial Bible . . ."—*Id.*, *Adam Bede*, ch. 21.—"It was Godfrey's custom on a Sunday afternoon to do a little contemplative farming in a leisurely walk."—*Id.*, *Silas Marner*, p. 230.

"On a summer evening he delighted to stroll down his fields as far as the allotment-grounds . . ."—T. E. Kebbel, *English Country Life* (London, 1891), p. 12.

" . . . but another pleasure I had, which, as it could be had only on a Saturday night, occasionally struggled with my love of the opera . . ."—De Quincey, *Confessions of an English Opium-Eater* (Boston, 1858), p. 77.—"This pleasure, I have said, was to be had only on a Saturday night."—*Ib.*, p. 77.—" . . . to which the poor resort on a Saturday night . . ."—*Ib.*, p. 78.

" . . . and it was rumoured that one of the Fellows rejoiced in seeing his parishioners play at cricket on Sunday."—F. W. Newman, *Phases of Faith*, ch. i, p. 4.

"To read the 'Voices of the Night,' in particular—those early pieces—is to be back at school again, on a Sunday, reading all alone on a summer's day, high in some tree, with a wide prospect of gardens and fields."—Andrew Lang, *Letters on Literature* (London, 1889), p. 45.

"Plaswater Weir-Mill Lock looked tranquil and pretty on an evening in the summer time."—Dickens, *Our Mutual Friend*, book iv, ch. i.

So, too, in the plural;

"On Sunday mornings I was always taken to church."—De Quincey, *Suspiria de Profundis*, p. 184.

" . . . the old wooden meeting-house in Salem, which used, on wintry Sabbaths, to be the frozen purgatory of my childhood . . ."—Nathaniel Hawthorne, *Our Old Home* (Boston, 1886), p. 83.

"The ramparts had been suffered to fall into decay, or were repaired only that the townsfolk might have a pleasant walk on summer evenings."—Macaulay, *History*, vol. i, ch. iii, p. 301.—"The *London Gazette* came out only on Mondays and Thursdays."—*Ib.*, p. 404.—" . . . on fine evenings, the fiddles were in attendance, and there were morris dances on the elastic turf of the bowling green."—*Ib.*, p. 360.

"They met once a week, on Monday evenings, at the Turk's Head, in Gerrard Street . . ."—Leslie and Taylor's *Life and Times of Sir Joshua Reynolds* (London, 1865), vol. i, p. 228.

"He went without dinner on Fridays . . ."—Thackeray, *Pendennis*, vol. ii, ch. xxv, p. 304.
—"Except on market days there is nobody in the streets."—*Ib.*, vol. i, ch. xv, p. 154.

"He [the English labourer] wears broad-cloth on Sundays, and sometimes at his work too."—E. T. Kebbel, *English Country Life*, p. 170.

But *of* is also found in such relations,—though not so often as *on*:

"Pen had been standing with his back to the window, and to such a dubious light as Bury Street enjoys of a foggy January morning."—*Pendennis*, vol. i, ch. xx, p. 222.—"So Mr. Pen and Miss Laura found the society at Clavering Park an uncommonly agreeable resort of summer evenings."—*Pendennis*, vol. i, ch. xxii, p. 252.

"It was his custom of a Sunday, when this meal was over, to sit close by the fire, a volume of some dry divinity on his reading desk. . . ."—Robert Louis Stevenson, *Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde*, ch. ii.

When the day, afternoon, evenings, etc., is not named or qualified by a defining word or phrase, a customary act or occurrence is regularly followed by *of*:

" . . . he was rarely to be found anywhere of an evening beyond the bounds of his own parish . . ."—George Eliot, *Mr. Gilfil's Love-Story*, ch. i.—"Mr. Bates is habitually a guest in the housekeeper's room of an evening . . ."—*Ib.*, ch. iv.—" . . . seated by his fireside of an evening . . ."—*Id.*, *Essays (Worldliness and other-Worldliness)*.

" . . . cutting down branches of a night to secure himself from the wild beasts . . ."—J. H. Newman, *Historical Sketches*, vol. ii, p. 401.

" . . . the staircase and passageway were often thronged of a morning with a set of beggarly and piratical-looking scoundrels . . ."—Nathaniel Hawthorne, *Our Old Home*, p. 19.

" . . . his father was quietly reading, according to his custom when he sat at home of an evening."—Henry James, *The Reverberator*, ch. viii.

" . . . after reading pretty hard of a morning, and, I fear, not law merely, but politics and general history and literature . . ."—*Pendennis*, vol. i, ch. xxx.

" . . . he used to have two candles on his table of an evening."—William Hazlitt, *Sketches and Essays* (London, 1884), p. 373.

"His waistcoat of a morning was pale buff—of an evening, embroidered velvet."—Lytton, *The Caxtons*, vol. i, part ii, ch. ii.

And in the plural:

" . . . and here Pen was introduced to a number of gallant young fellows with spurs and mustachios, with whom he drank pale-ale of mornings, and beat the town of a night."—*Pendennis*, ch. xix.

The observance by writers of the foregoing distinctions in the use of *on* and *of* is probably seldom premeditated, and no doubt is often neglected; but an examination of a large number of cases in a considerable variety of writing seems to show that customary usage recognizes the differences indicated. Linguistic distinctions are often blurred and confused by impressions of phrases similar in sound. Perhaps the distinctions we have been considering have been blurred, more or less, by the influence of such partitive phrases as those below.

" . . . when he and she and John, at towards nine o'clock of a winter evening, went to London . . ."—Dickens, *Our Mutual Friend*, Bk. iv, ch. xii.

"It was near nine o'clock of a moonlight evening . . ."—Nathaniel Hawthorne, *The Snow Image and other Twice-told Tales* (My Kinsman, Major Molineux).—"One afternoon of a cold winter's day, when the sun shone forth with chilly brightness . . ."—*Ib.*, *The Snow-Image*.

But there is a tendency to confuse *of* and *on* apart from such an influence. It should be added that Thackeray, although cited several times above, seems to have had no discriminative rule as to *on* and *of* in cases of customary action.

R. O. WILLIAMS.

New York.

NOTES ON LYRIC POETRY.

POPULAR poems have, in all ages, suggested replies and begot the inspiration of rival work. The tournament sonnet of the later days of Queen Elizabeth is well known, and has been frequently discussed though, one may suspect, not yet exhaustively. To anyone who is desirous of learning how widely diffused such parallels are, and in how great a depth of antiquity their originals are rooted, Prof. Albert S.

Cook's notes on the series, "Care Charmer Sleep" are to be recommended. (MOD. LANG. NOTES, iv, 8, 229, and v, 1, 11.) It is not with the sonnet that we are for the moment concerned, but with the direct answer to a previous poem, or a second poem written in imitation or emulation of an earlier one. As early as the second edition of Tottel's *Miscellany*—and I am not concerned here to look earlier than Tottel—we find verses answering the sentiments expressed in certain poems of the first impression; and subsequent anthologies show the same thing.

As might be supposed, the most popular poems were those most frequently answered, imitated, or parodied. Thus Marlowe's famous *Come live with me and be my love*, which first appeared in *The Passionate Pilgrim*, was reprinted the next year in *England's Helicon*, with two poems which its popularity had inspired. One of them is anonymous, the other is ascribed to Sir Walter Raleigh under the title, *The Nymph's Reply to the Shepherd*. This latter poem, which is almost as fine as Marlowe's original, takes the tone of a serious doubt of the duration and reality of "these pretty pleasures." Next comes Donne, who, while successfully imitating "the smooth lines of Kit Marlowe," characteristically fills his verses with conceits and makes his fair mistress "the bait."¹ Lastly and years after, Herrick transmutes pastoral, moralizing, and conceit into a pure little idyl of English country life, in which the maiden is promised:

Thy feasting-tables shall be hills
With daisies spread and daffodils;
Where thou shalt sit, and redbreast by
For meat shall give thee melody.²

In this series of lyrics, all on the same general theme, the nature of each poet is plainly discernible, and may be studied as to contrast better than where each has chosen his own subject. In another series of parallels, the poetical employment of a single figure—that in which the suit of a lover is likened to the attack or siege of a defended town—furnishes us with illustrations of several of the fashions in the lyric which succeeded each other between the reign of Henry VIII and

¹ See Donne, ed. 1650, p. 57.

² Hale, *Selections from Herrick*, p. 88.

that of James II. In the earliest version, that of Lord Vaux, entitled *The Assault of Cupid*, and printed in Tottel we have, after the manner of the time, a well sustained little allegory in which figure Fancy, "Desire shrouded in his targe," "Beauty walking up and down on the ramparts, bow in hand," and "Good-Will, the Master of shot." The citadel is the lover's heart which yields expeditiously to the assaults of Beauty. In a second version, that of *The Phoenix' Nest*, 1578, we are still in the land of allegory, but the opening line,

Pass forth in dolefull dumps, my verse,

the "grizzled grief," and "heavy hap," proclaim our proximity to the chilling atmosphere of that iceberg of these early poetical seas, *The Mirror for Magistrates*. Here the allegory is transferred to an attack by sea, and the pirate is Detraction, his ship manned by Ignorance, Suspicion and Envy. The unfortunate victim is captured and, bound by Carking Care and Fell Annoy, is brought before my Lady Disdain, thrown in prison, and denied even the access of his friend, Troth. These verses are a didactic observation on the ingratitude of the world, and as far from poetry as didactic verses usually are.

Passing by a poem in *The Gorgeous Gallery of Gallant Inventions*, 1578, (Park, *Heliconia*, p. 103) in which the figure is more than once employed, though not extensively, and omitting the cases of its use in prose in Painter's *Palace of Pleasure*, and elsewhere, we reach the anonymous *Beauty's Fort* (printed in Arber's *English Garner*, 1, 128), which dates later in the same century. Here we have the allegory of Lord Vaux inverted, and it is Beauty that is besieged by raging Love. Although the fair besieged has allies in Chastity and Prudence, "she hath traitors in her camp," and yields at last to the combined attacks of her outward and inner foes. Here the poet touches the moral note, but cleverly evades the question, remarking in conclusion:

She needs must yield her castle strong,
And Love triumphs once more:
'Tis only what the boy hath done
A thousand times before.

In 1580, Humphrey Gifford employed the same figure by way of simile in the following stanza of a very pretty poem (*A Posie of Gil-*

Ioflowers, Miscellanies of the Fuller Worthies Library, p. 84):

Like as a fort or fenced town,
By foes assault that lies in field,
When bulwarks all are beaten down,
Is by perforce constrained to yield:
So I that could no while withstand
The battery of your pleasant love,
The flag of truce took in my hand,
And meant your mercy for to prove.

With Sidney's *Stella! whence doth this new assault arise?* (*Astrophel and Stella*, Son. 36) the figure of siege and assault enters the voluminous sonnet literature of the age. It is found everywhere; in Linche's *Diella*, 1590;

When Love had first besieged my heart's strong wall,
Rampiered and countermured with Chastity,
And had with ordnance made his tops to fall,
Stooping their glory to his surquedry:
I called a parley, etc.,

and in the anonymous *Zepheria*, Canzon twenty-five; and in Percey's *Coelia*, of the same date, where the subject is elaborated into a whole sonnet.

In that curious and enigmatic book of verses, *Willobie his Avis*, 1594, this figure is recurred to again and again, and forms practically the theme of a whole part of the work. See especially: "To plant a siege and yet depart, etc." (Canto xix, Spenser Society's ed. of *Avisa*); "The wise men seek the strongest fort, And paper castles most detest" (ib. p. 39); and Canto xlix, where the figure is extended once more into the familiar allegory:

You are the chieftain that have laid
This heavy siege to strengthless fort,
And Fancy that my will betraid
Hath lent Despair his strongest port, etc.
(ib. p. 84).

Even Spenser did not disdain a variation on the familiar theme in his *Amoretti*, Son. xiv:

Retourne agayne, my forces late dismayd,
Unto the siege by you abandon'd quite.
Great shame it is to leave, like one afraid,
So fayre a peece for one repulse so light.
'Gainst such strong castles needeth greater might
Then those small forts which ye were wont belay:
Such haughty mynds, enur'd to hardy fight,
Disdayn to yield unto the first assay.

Years later when Carew wrote his *A Deposition from Love*, the old figure was flitting in his mind in the words, "Could we the fortress win," and again in the last stanza:

Hard fate! to have been once possess'd

As victor of a heart,
Achieved with labor and unrest,
And then forced to depart.
If the stout foe will not resign,
When I besiege a town,
I lose but what was never mine;
But he that is cast down
From enjoyed beauty, feels a woe
Only deposed kings can know.

At length the cynical coxcomby of Sir John Suckling casts this obvious old similitude into an imperishable artistic form in his poem, *The Siege*, which is too well known to need more than a mention here; and Sir Charles Sedley, original in nothing yet clever in all, echoed Sir John in the song of the third Act of *Bel-lamira*. (*Works of Sedley*, ed. 1778, ii, 141.) With this we may dismiss the subject.

One of the neatest pieces of actual parody amongst the lyrics of the age of Elizabeth is one pointed out by Mr. Bullen, in the Introduction to his *Lyrics from Elizabethan Romances*. Thomas Lodge, who is frequently imitative of the matter and manner of French poets, his contemporaries and predecessors, imitates one of the meters of Ronsard in a particularly daring manner, in the well-known "novel," *Rosalynde*. The verses run thus:

Phoebe sate,
Sweet she sate,
Sweete sate Phoebe when I saw her,
.....
Phoebe sat
By a fount:
Sitting by a fount I spied her.

Nash parodied (*Tarlton's Newes out of Purgatory*, ed. Huth Library):

Down I sat,
I sat down
Where Flora had bestowed her graces,
Green it was,
It was green
Far passing other places.
.....
There I sat,
I sat there,
Viewing of this pride of places:
Straight I saw,
I saw straight
The sweetest fair of all fair faces.

Less delicate, though certainly more direct, is Jonson's parody, stanza for stanza, of an immortal Song of George Wither. Wither had written:

Shall I, wasting in despair,
Die, because a woman's fair?

Or my cheeks make pale with care,
'Cause another's rosy are?
Be she fairer than the day,
Or the flowery meads in May!
If she be not so to me,
What care I, how fair she be?

Jonson replied:

Shall I, mine affections slack,
'Cause I see a woman's black?
Or myself with care cast down,
'Cause I see a woman's brown?
Be she blacker than the night,
Or the blackest jet in sight!
If she be not so to me,
What care I how black she be?

Can it be that Jonson had in mind, in this stanza, Shakespeare's well-known sonnet, beginning: "My Mistress' eyes are nothing like the sun?" Another poem, graver and finer than Jonson's, though also written under the suggestion of Wither's, will be found in Hannah's *Poems of Raleigh*, etc., p. 82, in which occurs this stanza:

Shall I like an hermit dwell
On a rock or in a cell,
Calling home the smallest part
That is missing of my heart,
To bestow it, where I may
Meet a rival every day?
If she undervalue me,
What care I how fair she be?

In a volume entitled *Poems by Francis Beaumont*, printed in 1640, there is a poem *On the Life of Man*. It has also been included amongst the works of Bishop Henry King. (See *The Works of Beaumont and Fletcher*, ed. Dyce, ii, 952; and *Poems of King*, ed. Hannah, pp. lxii, cxviii.)

Like to the falling of a star,
Or as the flight of eagles are,
Or like the fresh spring's gaudy hue
Or silver drops of morning dew
.....
Even such is man, whose borrowed light
Is straight called in and paid to night:
.....
The dew's dried up, the star is shot,
The flight is past, the man forgot.

Ellis in his *Specimens of Early English Poets* (ii, 339), quotes from a series of similitudes on the same theme, which he refers to the authorship of one Simon Wastell in a book entitled *Microbiblion*, 1629. If the poem from which I have just quoted is Beaumont's, the question of priority is easily settled. In any case the in-

feriority of Wastell's work would point to it as the imitation.

Like the damask rose you see,
Or like the blossoms of the tree,
Or like the dainty flower of May,
Or like the morning of the day, etc.

.....
E'en such is man;—whose thread is spun,
Drawn out, and cut, and so is done.—
The rose withers, the blossom blasteth,
The flower fades, the morning hasteth, etc.

Once more we meet with a string of similitudes, this time evidently intentionally absurd, applied to the same subject. These verses, which I find in *Wit's Recreation*, a species of degenerate anthology or miscellany, published in several editions between 1640 and 1680, are the work of Bishop Corbet, and are appropriately entitled, *A Messe of Non-sense*. A few lines will suffice:

Like to the tone of unspoke speeches,
Or like a lobster clad in logic breeches,
Or like the gray frieze of a crimson cat,
Or like a mooncalf in a slipshoe-hat,
Or like a shadow when the sun is gone,
Or like a thought that ne'er was thought upon:

.....
E'en such is man, who breathless, without doubt,
Spake to small purpose when his tongue was out.

The poetry of Donne from its originality, and the cynical mood in which he frequently indulges, led to many replies and imitations. The Song beginning: *Go and catch a falling star*, especially calls into question woman's faith and fidelity, and affirms that one who has ridden "ten thousand days and nights," upon his return must swear,

Nowhere
Lives a woman true and fair,

In Habington's *Castara*, the theme of which is the praise of chastity and womanly virtue, there is a direct answer to this poem, entitled, *Against them that lay unchastity to women*. This poem begins:

They meet with but unwholesome springs
And summers which infectious are,
They hear but when the mermaid sings,
And only see the falling star,
.....
Who ever dare
Affirm no woman chaste and fair.

Another very popular poem of Donne is entitled *The Indifferent*. In it the poet affirms his affluent ability to "love both fair and brown,"

Her whom abundance melts, and her whom want betrays,
Her who loves loneliness best, her who masks and plays.

The earliest imitation of this poem with which I am acquainted is that of Alexander Brome. (See Calmer's *English Poets*, vi, 645.) The second stanza runs:

I vow, I am so far from loving none,
That I love everyone:
If fair, I must; if brown she be,
She's lovely, and for sympathy,
'Cause we're alike, I love her;
If tall, she's proper; and if short,
She's humble, and I love her for't.

Cowley's *Inconstant* is modelled on the same poem, and from certain similarities of expression may have been another source or an imitation of Brome's verses; it might be difficult to determine which. Brome was about Cowley's age, and his works, though doubtless written long before, were not published until the year of the Restoration. This stanza from Cowley's *Inconstant* will sufficiently indicate the parallel to which I refer:

If tall, the name of "proper" slays,
If fair, she's pleasant in the light,
If low, her prettiness does please,
If black, what lover loves not night?
If yellow-haired, I love lest it should be
Th' excuse to others for not loving me.

A fourth poem on the same theme is Suckling's *Guiltless Inconstant*.

Without going into the particulars, other borrowings from Donne will be found in these cases: Donne's *Love's Growth* and his *Woman's Constancy* are respectively the sources of Suckling's *True Love* and *Constancy*; and Donne's *Absence hear thou my protestation* (for which see Davison's *Poetical Rhapsody*), which repeats as a central idea the thought of his song: *Soul's joy, now I am gone*, offers Carew the suggestion of one of the most effective passages of his poem, *To his Mistress Confined*.

Waller's well-known song, *Go lovely rose*, appears in *Wit's Recreations*, with two other poems all nearly on the same theme. One of these is Waller's own, beginning: *Lately on yonder fragrant bush*, the other is a poem of Herrick, in subject and manner sufficiently close to raise the question, who was the borrower? Herrick's lines run:

Go happy rose, and interweave
With other flowers bind my love;
Tell her too, she must not be

Longer peevish, longer free,
That so long hath fettered me, etc.

This parallel I find noted by Mr. G. Thorne Drury, in his excellent edition of Waller, together with a number of others bearing upon this poem. The mention of this most popular of the lyrics of Waller naturally suggests the poem that shares that popularity, the lines *On a Girdle*, and a couple of parallels not given by Mr. Drury. In his charming little poem, *Upon Julia's Ribband*, Herrick says in simple affirmation as to that article of Julia's attire:

Nay 'tis the zonulet of love
Wherein all pleasures of the world are wove.

The language is direct, the idea fancifully but tastefully treated; Herrick employs an unusual and musical word, "zonulet," and his versification is free and artistic.

Give me but what this ribband bound,
Take all the rest the world goes round!

cries Waller in rhetorical exclamation, reducing fancy to sense, avoiding unusual words, but practicing an end-stopped verse of unexceptional regularity. Lastly, though perhaps prior in time, Cleveland contorts the same thought into a "conceit," far-fetched and unpoetical, and asks:

Is not the universe straight-laced,
When I can clasp it in a waist?

FELIX E. SCHELLING.

University of Pennsylvania.

THE PASTORAL ELEMENT IN THE ENGLISH DRAMA BEFORE 1605.

MOST accounts of the English pastoral drama have begun with Fletcher's *Faithful Shepherdess* or Daniel's *Queen's Arcadia*. There have been references, of course, to some of Lyly's plays, Peele's *Arraignment of Paris* and Sidney's *May Lady*, but there has been no recognition of a continuous and considerable development of the pastoral drama before Daniel and Fletcher introduced the genre already highly developed by Tasso and Guarini.

It is the purpose of this paper to present evidence of such a development before 1605, the date of Daniel's *Arcadia*; and this evidence will fall naturally into two divisions. First, we shall consider evidence of a pastoral element in entertainments and shows presented to the

queen; and secondly, we shall consider plays and allusions to plays which show that pastorals were not uncommon on the London stage. The evidence under the first head has for the most part not been presented before, and that under the second has not all been previously utilized.

Taken altogether, this evidence will be enough to throw some light on many questions concerning the origin and development of English pastoral drama. The important and direct influence of the Italian drama on Fletcher and Daniel is well known, but the existence of an English pastoral drama prior to their plays at once suggests that they may have been influenced by it, as well as by the Italian forms. The extent and character of Italian influence on this early English development offers another subject for investigation. While the existence of such Italian influence is undoubted, the existence of a characteristic English development apart from foreign influence is equally to be expected. In the main, we shall leave to one side the question of Italian influence, and point only to such conclusions in regard to the characteristics of the drama as the evidence seems *prima facie* to warrant. In fact we shall try to do little more than to present the evidence.

I. THE PASTORAL ELEMENT IN ROYAL ENTERTAINMENTS BEFORE 1605.

The theory of Rossi¹ that the Italian pastoral drama was developed from the eclogue through the medium of public pageants in honor of noble families, at once suggests the possibility of a similar development in England. The pastoral idea, in general, was a fashionable cult of the court: and the pastoral plays of Lyly, Peele, and Daniel, were all court entertainments. In the royal shows, then, if anywhere, we might expect to find germs of the finished form. I have, therefore, examined the accounts of the entertainments presented to Queen Elizabeth on her various progresses in order to discover whether or not they contain any elements such as afterwards appear more highly developed in the pastoral plays of Fletcher and Jonson. Such elements do appear, and will be briefly enumerated.

¹ Battista Guarini, ed II Pastor Fido, 1886. Part^o ii, Chap. 1.

A word may first be prefaced in regard to the character of these royal entertainments. Wherever the queen made a journey she was greeted with an oration or show, and often with an elaborate entertainment, highly spectacular, and more or less dramatic. Sometimes the village schoolmaster, or some local functionary prepared the show; sometimes a court favorite like Gascoigne, or a great gentleman like Sidney, devised the entertainments. Hence their artistic quality varies widely. Some of them, doubtless, suggested Shakspeare's burlesque in the pageants of Holofernes and Bottom, the weaver; and, on the other hand, some of them with their songs and fairies may possibly have suggested the beautiful conception of *Midsummer Night's Dream*. They also vary widely in their subject matter. Some with their allegorical characters are like the old moralities, some have deities and scenes from classical mythology, some fairies and bits of folk lore, some are satirical, some deal with romance and chivalry, and some have pastoral elements such as shepherds and satyrs. Often the performance contained a mixture of several of these varieties, and the only invariable point of similarity was the fulsome panegyric to the virgin queen.

In considering the pastoral elements I shall give a broad meaning to the phrase and take account of everything which can have had any relation to the pure pastoral drama. It must be remembered, too, that the accounts which we have of these entertainments before the queen are few compared with the number actually presented, and that we have no records at all of the many given before private persons. A single representation which has been preserved may, therefore, be taken as typical of a considerable number; and the existence of any pastoral elements may fairly be considered proof that such elements were not uncommon.

The first indication of anything at all pastoral is a reference to "a mask of wild men" performed at Greenwich in 1873.² The mask is lost. The connection between wild men and satyrs will appear later.

In 1575, at Kenilworth,³ George Gascoigne

² F. G. Fleay, *A Chronicle of the English Drama*, 1559-1142, ii, 341.

³ Nichols, *Progresses of Elizabeth*. Vol. i, p. 436.

→ 1573

prepared several devices to add to the interest of Leicester's entertainment. One evening as the queen was returning from the chase, she was greeted by a "Humbre Salvagio," "with an oaken plant pluct up by the roots in his hands, himself foregrone all in moss and ivy." At the end of his speech he called on "his familiars and companions, fawns, satyrs, nymphs, dryads, and hamadryads." None answered but echo; and then ensued a long dialogue between the wild man and echo. Here, then, we have a representative of the satyr type and the device of the echo dialogue, both elements of the pastoral drama.

This show seems to have been favorably received, for a similar exhibition⁴ was at once prepared, but for some reason not presented. In the midst of an entertainment presenting Diana and her nymphs, a man clad all in moss comes in and announces that he is the son of the "humbre salvagio" and has a similar dialogue with echo.

On another day,⁵ as the queen was going hunting, she was meet by Gascoigne, "dressed as Sylvanus, god of the woods." He made a long speech, running along by her horse, and led her to a bush, whence "deep desire" was heard speaking. This business of a voice from a bush or tree is repeated in other entertainments, and also in *Pastor Fido* (i, 4), where we have "a shrill voice from riv'd beech." In Gascoigne's device, Pan, Diana, and her nymphs also appear.

These three Kenilworth devices show that the introduction into English drama of Diana and her nymphs, and wilder denizens of the woods, such as Pan, Sylvanus, and the satyr tribe, goes back at least to 1575. As in later representations, it is the hunting horns which disturb these wood-dwellers. It seems certain that Gascoigne borrowed most of this pastoral material directly from similar Italian performances.

In 1578, at Wanstead, the Contention of a Forester and a Shepherd for a May Lady, by Sir Philip Sidney, was presented before the queen. Here for the first time we find shepherds and a distinct pastoral setting. The old shepherd, afterwards a favorite character, makes his first English appearance; the chorus of

foresters and shepherds reminds us of the chorus of huntsmen and shepherds in *Pastor Fido* (iv, 6); and Therion, the hunter, who is rude and sometimes strikes the lady, and his rival Espiles, who is mild and gentle, are rudimentary types not unlike the contrasted Silvio and Mirtillo. The singing match is also a bit of dramatized eclogue; but, on the other hand, the burlesque schoolmaster, and the lady, dressed like "an honest man's wife of the country," are English elements quite foreign to the conventional pastoral genre.

I have found no other traces of a pastoral element in the accounts of the queen's progresses until 1591. At Cowdray in that year, a wild man awaited the queen by a tree and made a speech.

In 1592 at Bissam,⁶ on the queen's arrival at the top of the hill, she was again met by a wild man who made a speech full of references to Pan, Sylvanus, and Echo.⁷ At the middle of the hill, "sate Pan and two virgins keeping sheep and sewing in their samplers." Pan made love to the shepherdesses, and a long dialogue ensued, the subject of which may be well enough described in two phrases of the virgins—"the follies of the gods who became beasts for their affections; the honour of virgins who became goddesses for their chastity." At the bottom of the hill, Ceres and her nymphs completed the show. Here, then, we have again the satyr element both in the wild man and Pan, who woos the virgins with presents of chestnuts; and the chastity motive, so highly developed in later drama.

In the same year at Sudely,⁸ an old shepherd greeted her majesty in a pastoral strain, praising the country as a very Arcadia where "we carry our hearts at our tongues' ends, being as far from dissembling as our sheep from fierceness;" and presenting her with a lock of wool "in which nothing is to be esteemed but the whiteness, virginity's color; nor to be expected but duty, the shepherd's religion.

On a Sunday, at the same place, there was a performance in which Apollo appeared running after Daphne, while a shepherd followed lamenting the loss of his nymph. Apollo turned Daphne into a tree, "and on one side of the tree appeared one who sung; and on the other,

⁴ Nichols i, 503.

⁵ Nichols i, 575.

⁶ Nichols iii, 135. ⁷ Nichols iii, 137. ⁸ Nichols iii, 137.

one who played." After the song the tree rived; Daphne appeared; and upon being pursued by Apollo, fled to her majesty," uttering this—"for whither should chastity fly for succour but to the queen of chastity?"—and so on, in a long panegyric on chastity and the virgin queen.

On another day at the same place,⁹ there was a speech by one "cloked in a sheep's skin, face and all." Then her majesty was brought among shepherds, among whom was a queen and king to be chosen. Melibaeus and Nisa appeared as shepherds, also the Cutter of Cootsholde, a comic and not a pastoral personage.

In these entertainments we find again the pastoral setting, the exploitation of chastity, and the mixture of mythological and English country characters. These entertainments also warrant us in concluding that the representation of shepherds and nymphs and wild men, was not uncommon in such pageants. Pastoralism was certainly popular in the literature of the day, and played a considerable part in these theatrical shows, even when the pieces were not pastoral in theme or character. This prevalence of the pastoral may be illustrated by a few lines from a masque of knights and ladies,¹⁰ in which the queen of fairies had a part. The lines are, I think, fairly typical of many similar songs and pastoral allusions.

"Of our new destiny
Echo, echo, certify,
Farewell all in woods that dwell,
Farewell Satyrs, nymphs farewell,
Adieu desires, fancies die,
Farewell all inconstancy."

From 1592 on, the queen's progresses were very infrequent, and only one other pastoral entertainment appears. In 1600-1 a "Dialogue between two shepherds, Thenot and Piers, in praise of Astrea," was recited at the home of the author, the Countess of Pembroke. It is simply an eclogue.

One of the first entertainments offered to Queen Anne must be added to complete our list. In her progress to her coronation (1603), she was entertained at Althorpe with a kind of masque written by Ben Jonson, and entitled "The Complaint of the Satyrs against the Nymphs." A satyr was lodged in a spinet

⁹ Nichols iii, 142.

¹⁰ Nichols iii, 202.

(little wood), by which her majesty and the prince were to come, and advancing his head above the top of the wood, he began:

"Here! there! and everywhere!
Some solemnities are near
That these changes strike my ear,
My pipe and I a part shall bear," etc.

After piping a strain he ran out and welcomed the queen. Then a bevy of fairies, headed by Queen Mab, tripped out and began to dance and sing. Thereupon the satyr

"came hopping forth, and mixing himself with the fairies, skipped in, out, and about their circle, while they made offers to catch him."

He mocked them in a long song, of which a few lines will indicate the tenor:

"This is she that empties cradles
Takes out children, puts in lads,
Trains forth midwives in their slumber
With a sieve the holes to number
And then leads them from her burrows
Home through ponds and water furrows."

The fairies declared to Queen Mab,

"This is only spite
For you would not yester night
Kiss him in the cock shut light."

Then they caught him and pinched him black and blue. The satyr ran away, but later reappeared, and in a long speech to Queen Anne, closed the ceremony.

So far as I know, the foregoing are the only bits of pastoral pageants before 1605 which have been preserved. Meagre as they are, they may be fairly taken, I think, to indicate that Daniel and Fletcher did not work in an altogether untried field. Even apart from the plays of Lyly and Peele, and the masques of Sidney and Jonson, the entertainments of the queen's progresses show a considerable amount of the pastoral element. Before 1600 the chastity motive, the setting of shepherds and hunters, the story of unrequited love, the singing contest, the hunting party with sounding horns—all these had become material of the pastoral drama. Some characters, too, such as the satyr type, the rude forester, and the venerable shepherd, were pretty familiar. That, after all, this is a small contribution, that Daniel and Fletcher are to be credited with

creative work, goes without saying; but in the light of these earlier pastoral dramatic attempts, it hardly seems possible that their work could have seemed absolutely new either to themselves or the Elizabethan public.

How far Italian influence can be traced in these early pastoral exhibitions cannot probably be definitely determined. I find no sure indications of the influence of either *Aminta* or *Pastor Fido*. These plays may have had an effect in increasing the prevalence of pastoral exhibitions after 1580; but, on the other hand, this prevalence must in a considerable measure have resulted from the popularity of pastoral poetry in general. Most of the pastoral entertainments might have well enough been suggested by the pastoral eclogues and romances. At the same time, there can be no doubt that the use of the pastoral in royal entertainments was at least suggested in the cases of Gascoigne and Sidney by similar pastoral entertainments in Italy.

The mixture of pastoral with mythological elements is only natural, both being taken from classical sources; and is, in fact, to be found in nearly all pastoral drama. The mixture of pastoral with native comic characters is, perhaps, more distinctively an English development. It may, indeed, possibly be taken as an evidence of the influence of contemporary public plays, though to some extent this mixture was anticipated in Spenser's and Barclay's eclogues. Pastoral poetry, at any rate, anticipated the pastoral drama in the introduction of contemporary satire. However, the honest country woman and the pedant Rombus of Sidney's *May Lady*, and the Cutter of Cootsholde at Sudeley, are worth noting, since they precede Daniel's use of contemporary satire, and Shakspeare's introduction of English rustics, in the *Arcadia* of *As You Like It*.

More notable as an English variation is the development of the satyr type. Just what connection or difference existed between the wild man of the woods and the satyr, would probably have puzzled both spectators and authors to explain. How dim their ideas may have been, can be surmised from a contemporary description of a stone figure at Hamstead. Nichols¹¹ points out its resemblance to Gas-

coigne's "Humbre Salvagio"—"all his limbs being covered with thick hair and his loins surrounded with a girdle of foliage;" and from the illustration, it certainly appears to have been intended for a wild man. The contemporary account, however, calls it a "figure of Hercules with his club."

The wild man of the earliest entertainments is covered with moss, dwells in the woods, and is the companion of satyrs and nymphs. This wild man is differentiated from Silvanus, the god of the woods; but the two look much alike. Later the wild man appears with Pan who woos a shepherdess. Wild man, Humbre Salvagio, Silvanus, or Pan; the personage is the same from a theatrical point of view. So far as we can determine the characteristics with which he is endowed, he is a simple, wild animal, who lives like a squirrel, who ordinarily frolics with the nymphs, and plays his pipe in peace, but who comes forth in wonderment to see the queen.

There is nothing of the classical satyr's lasciviousness in this,¹² nothing of the rude lust of the satyr of the Italian pastoral drama. The satyr kind of the pageants certainly owed nothing to the elaborate development of the satyr in the Italian drama. In Ben Jonson's masque the difference is even greater. The satyr, there so-named, is introduced as the companion of Queen Mab and her fairies. He is a creature not of Arcadia but of fairyland. He is a singer, a piper, a merry fellow, and in addition serves as a messenger and a sort of chorus. This satyr, however, in his appearance from a bush, his wonderment at the queen's appearance, his long address, his introduction of the host, serves in the same situations and performs the same duties as the wild man. Here, then, we possibly have a direct contribution to the pastoral drama. From the wild man to Jonson's satyr is only a short step, and from Jonson's satyr to Fletcher's is an equally short step. The satyr in the *Faithful Shepherdess* is far removed from the lustful satyrs of *Sacrificio*, *Aminta*, or *Pastor Fido*; he again is an artless creature near related to the fairies, and serves as messenger and chorus. He gains of

¹² So far as the wild man is classical, he is clearly a faun rather than a satyr; and so indeed are Fletcher and Jonson's satyrs. The Elizabethans seem to have confused the two.

¹¹ Nichols ii, p. 121.

course in refinement from the delicacy of the verse, and the moral element elaborated in his adoration of chastity. This spontaneous reverence for chastity, however, also appeared in the wild men and Pan, when they encountered Elizabeth. From the wild men to Fletcher's satyr, then, we have what looks like a development peculiar to English soil; and, in this connection, it is worth noting that as theatrical parts, these are points of similarity between Fletcher's satyr and Shakspeare's Ariel.

II. THE PASTORAL ELEMENT IN THE PUBLIC THEATRE BEFORE 1605.

In tracing the pastoral element in the public drama, we shall first examine the extant plays, and then note the references to pastoral plays, that are not extant. None of the extant plays are pure pastorals like *Pastor Fido* or the *Faithful Shepherdess*. In the extent of their use of mythological characters and stories, they rather resemble such an early pastoral drama as Politian's *Orfeo*. Some of their mythological material, however, as for example, Lyly's use of a miraculous transformation, of an oracle, of a festival to some God, or of the tracing of divine descent, may fairly be called the common property of all pastoral plays. More distinctly pastoral elements, such as shepherds, song contests, and the story of unrequited love also appear.

The Arraignment of Paris, by George Peele. First quarto 1584. Probably acted about 1508.

The main part of the play deals with classical mythology; but here, as in some of the entertainments, Diana and her nymphs are brought in close connection with shepherds. The chorus of shepherds also appears, and in the first act a shepherd is contrasted with a hunter. The story of Colin's unrequited love and the talk of his fellow shepherds Hobbino, Thenot, and Diggon, follow the *Shepherd's Calendar*. The probability of Italian influence is also apparent from an Italian song of twelve lines¹³ which is incorporated in the text. Oenone appears as a nymph among the shepherds, and Paris is alluded to as "Amyntas' lovely boy," probably a reference to Watson's *Amyntas*.¹⁴

Gallathea, by John Lyly. Entered S. R.

¹³ Act ii, p. 350, Routledge Edition.

¹⁴ Act iii, p. 360; also cf. p. 584, note.

1585. First quarto 1587. Written about 1580.¹⁵

The sacrifice of a virgin to Neptune forms the basis of the plot as in *Pastor Fido*. Melibeus and Tyterus are shepherds; Gallathea and Phyllida are their daughters, who assume boys clothing to avoid the sacrifice. Diana's nymphs again appear in connection with the shepherds; each of the nymphs, in fact, falls in love with a shepherd. With their loves, and the love which springs up between Gallathea and Phyllida, there is a complication of love affairs something like that of the later pastoral drama. Besides this pastoral story, the play has a large mythological element, a ship-wreck, and a good deal of contemporary satire. The pastoral element, however, is quite distinct and brings us nearer than any previous play to the later forms of Daniel and Fletcher.

Love's Metamorphosis by John Lyly. First quarto 1601. Acted, probably, about 1580. Revived (see title page) 1597-1600.

The title page of the first quarto describes the play as "a wittie and wurthy pastorall," and the scene is given Arcadia. Nisa, Celia, Niobe, and Tirtena appear as nymphs of Ceres, and the first three have importunate lovers in Ramis, Montanus, and Silvestris. These last are spoken of as amorous foresters and hunters;¹⁶ neither shepherds nor sheep are mentioned. In content, however, the play is, perhaps, nearer to the developed pastoral form than any other of Lyly's. Each of the foresters woos a nymph, and each nymph refuses very persistently, so there is an opportunity for a good many love dialogues,¹⁷ and much bemoaning of unrequited love. There is also a good deal of praise of chastity and talk of "gods amorous and virgins immortal, goddesses full of crueltie, and men of unhappiness." [V. 1.]

There are a few other distinct pastoral elements; for example, the writing of verses on the trees (i. 1), the nymphs celebrating the festival (i. 2), and Fidelias who "chased with a Satyre, by prayer to the gods became turned to a tree" (i. 2).

The title page shows that the play was intended for a pastoral, hence we may assume that a story of unrequited love was definitely

¹⁵ Cf. *Endymion*, Ed. by G. P. Baker, 1894. Introduction.

¹⁶ Act i, sc. 2. ¹⁷ Cf. act i, sc. 1 act iii, sc. 1; act v, sc. 2.

recognized as the proper content of a pastoral.

Midas by John Lyly. Entered S. R. 1591. First quarto 1592. Acted 1590(?).

The pastoral element is very slight, but Apollo, Pan, and nymphs appear in conjunction with five shepherds, Menaleus, Coryn, Celthus, Draipon, and Amyntas. There occurs, too, a long dispute between a huntsman and other servants, on the merits of hunting (iv, 3). Furthermore, in the prologue, spoken in Pauls, there is an allusion which seems to show that plays called pastorals were common on the stage.

"At our exercises, souldiers call for tragedies, their object is blood; courtiers for comedies, their subject is love; countermen for pastorals, shepherds are their saints."

In this connection, Polonius' words to Hamlet may be recalled.—"The best actors in the world, either for . . . pastoral, pastoral-comical, historical-pastoral—," etc. Lyly's prologue seems to show that even by 1590 the pastoral was recognized to be a distinct kind of drama, just like tragedy, comedy, or history.

Amphrisa, the Forsaken Shepherdess, or *Pelopoea and Alope* by Thomas Heywood. First printed in *Dialogues and Dramas*, 1636. Identified by Mr. Fleay¹⁸ with one of the *Five Plays in One* acted at the Rose, 1597. This identification is plausible, but by no means certain, so this play may have been written after 1605.

This is a pure pastoral but is very brief, occupying only eleven quarto pages. Pelopoea and Alope, two shepherdesses, appear and speak of Amphrisa's false lover who has forsaken her. Amphrisa then enters; and a long conversation ensues, which results in the conclusion that the only remedy for injuries is patience. The queen of the country, with her nymphs, now enters. They have been chasing the stag and after telling of their exploits, listen in hiding, to the talk of the Arcadian girls, and are charmed by it. Amphrisa meanwhile is presented with a willow garland so that:

"All th' Arcadian swains and nymphs that see
Your brows ingirt with this forsaken wreath
Will take note of his falsehood and your faith;
Your innocence and his inconstancy."

The queen finally discovers herself, complements the shepherdesses; and several songs and dances close the entertainment.

¹⁸ *Chronicle of Drama*, vol. i, p. 286.

The Woman in the Moon: by John Lyly. Entered S. R. 1595. First quarto 1597. Probably written between 1590-5.

As often in Lyly's plays, the main action depends on transformation, and there are plenty of mythological personages: the pastoral element, however, is considerable.

Four "Utopian shepherds," "all clad in skins" appear, ask for a female companion, and sing a roundelay. Pandora is given them, and throughout the play they appear as suitors; Stesias in particular, filling the part of the forsaken, scorned, and love-sick swain. To settle their contention, she sends them:

"to slay the savage boar
Which roaring up and down with ceaseless rage
Destroys the fruit of our Utopian fields
And he that first presents us with his head
Shall wear my glove in favour of the deed." (ii, 1.)

Later, the shepherds dispute who had the largest share in slaying the boar. The passage suggests the incident of Silvio's victory over the boar in *Pastor Fido* (iv, 3). There seems, indeed, to be a similarity in phrasing. The *Pastor Fido* is also suggested by another incident, when Pandora's servant tells her: "Mistress, my mayster is in this cave, thinking to meet you, and search us here." (iv, 1.) Still further, we find a trace of the Satyr motive. Pandora, who becomes light and wanton through Venus' agency (iii, 2.), enters in company with Joculo, and the following dialogue ensues.

P. Prethee be quiet, wherefore should I daunce?
J. Thus daunce the Satyrs on the even lawnes.
P. Thus, pretty Satyr, will Pandora daunce.
Cupid. And thus will Cupid make her melody.
J. Were I a man I would love thee.
P. I am a mayden, wilt thou have me?
J. But Stesias says thou art not.
P. What then? I care not. (iii, 2.)

Joculus thus appears to be a sort of satyr; he does not come on the stage again. "Utopian" is rather curious for Arcadian, but the two seem to be the same as far as the nature of the scene is concerned. The setting of shepherds and an Arcadian-like country, and the story of unrequited love appear again, and the satyr element appears for the first time, I believe, in the regular drama.

The Maid's Metamorphosis; anonymous. First quarto 1600.

Whether this was an old play (as early as 1590)

revived, or was written shortly before publication, are questions which do not especially concern us; nor does the question of authorship, although we may note that it has been attributed to Lyly, and is thought by Mr. Fleay to have been written by Lyly and Daniel.

The play is a medley in which Apollo and the muses, a magician, fairies, court people, clowns, shepherds, and foresters, all appear; and the main action deals with the transformation of the heroine into a boy and back again. If the author be not Lyly, his indebtedness to Lyly is manifest; and his indebtedness to the *Fairy Queen* is also marked. The pastoral element, however, follows dramatic conventions that were earlier instituted.

The heroine, Eurymine, is saved from death, but banished from court. She wanders in a forest, where she meets with Silvio, "a ranger," and Genulo, a shepherd, who at first, take her for a nymph or goddess and immediately become rivals for her love. Then ensues a long poetical contention as to whose house she shall be taken, in which forester and shepherd proclaim the merits of their respective callings in genuine pastoral style. This contention ends in rival songs by a chorus of shepherds and a chorus of woodmen. Eurymine settles the dispute by accepting a cottage from the forester and a flock from the shepherd. The whole scene at once recalls Sidney's *May Lady*, and was very likely suggested by that entertainment. In this scene, in the rivalry of the forester and shepherd throughout the play, and in the choruses of woodmen and shepherds, we are still further reminded of the *Pastor Fido*. If the play was written as late as 1600, I should think there could be little question of the influence of Guarini; this influence, however, seems general, rather than specific; the direct indebtedness seems to be to Sidney.

Eurymine is now established as a shepherdess; her lover Ascanio seeks her in vain; the rivals woo her in another eclogue, and Apollo, whose advances are repulsed, transforms her into a boy.

Among the distinct pastoral elements, we have an elaborate echo dialogue, in form exactly like that of Gascoigne's; and the rival song contest of shepherd and forester when they serenade

Eurymine. The comic dialogues of the clowns—Joculo, the court clown, Frisco, the forester's boy, and Mopso, the shepherd's boy—furnish in addition some bits of real English rusticity. Throughout, moreover, there are many pastoral references, and the forest is obviously Arcadian.

In short, we have the pastoral element so well developed that it suggests Guarini, but on the other hand, the mythological and transformation and comic dialogue scenes, show at least a direct imitation of Lyly. The pastoral scenes, too, follow Sidney and Gascoigne, and are not very different from Lyly's. At all events, the play adds definite evidence of the use of pastoral elements in the drama, and takes its place in the development from the early forms of Gascoigne and Sidney. It shows, too, a pretty highly developed pastoral play at least five years before the *Queen's Arcadia*.

As You Like It: Shakspeare. Entered S.R. 1602. Probably first acted in later half 1599.

Arden is a sort of Arcadia, inhabited by pastoral shepherds and court ladies in pastoral disguise. The disguised shepherdess appears also, it will be remembered, in the *Maid's Metamorphosis*. In the unrequited love of Silvius for Phoebe, in his laments and her rebuffs, we find again a distinct pastoral element. Shakspeare took practically the whole of this pastoral element from Lodge's *Rosalynde*. Just as the *Shepherd's Calendar*, and the *Fairy Queen*, and doubtless Sidney's *Arcadia*, influenced the stage pastoral, so here a pastoral novel receives dramatization. Moreover, the dramatized pastoral and, in particular, the presentation of the pastoral story of unrequited love, must have already been familiar on the stage.

We shall now consider some evidences of the existence of other pastoral plays not extant, and then enumerate in chronological order all the entertainments or plays before 1605, containing pastoral elements.

Phyllida and Covin, presented at court by the Queen's men, Dec. 26, 1584.¹⁹

A Pastoral Tragedy; by George Chapman. He received £2 in earnest of a tragedy by this name from Henslow, July 17, 1599.

The Arcadian Virgin; by Chettle and Haughton. From Henslow's diary, we learn

¹⁹ F. G. Fleay, *Chronicle of Drama*, vol. ii, p. 297.

that the authors were advanced money on this play, Dec. 13, and 17, 1599.

Still further evidence of the existence of pastoral plays is found in Henslow's inventory of stage properties, 1598, where there is mention of "two white shepherds coats." Apart from this, there is no evidence of any pastoral play, or play with shepherds in it, performed by his company before 1598.

In *Mucedorus* (earliest known quarto 1598, but play certainly older) there is mention of "a mask of shepherds, presented by Lord Jules" (i, 1). Mr. Fleay says this mention is an addition of the 1606 quarto, and identifies it with the shepherds mask of the time of James I, but this latter he elsewhere says is Jonson's *Pan's Anniversary*, of June 16, 1623.²⁰ At all events the mask alluded to was probably acted before 1605.

LIST OF ENTERTAINMENTS AND PLAYS, CONTAINING PASTORAL ELEMENTS BEFORE 1605.

- 1573. A Mask of Wild Men at Greenwich. Fleay, *Chr.* ii, 341.
- 1575. Entertainments to the Queen at Kenilworth, Gascoigne. Nichols i, 436, 503, 575.
- 1578. May Lady at Wapstead. Sidney.
- 1581. (Before 84) Arraignment of Paris at court. Peele.
- 1582. (Before 85) Gallathea, at court. Lyly.
- 1582. (Before 1600) Love's Metamorphosis. Lyly.
- 1584. Phyllida and Corin, at court. Anonymous.
- 1590. (Before 1592) Midas, at court and in public (most of those court plays were probably also acted on public stage by children's companies). Lyly.
- 1591. Wild Man at Cowdray.
- 1592. Entertainment to the Queen at Bossans. Nichols iii, 135 seq.
- 1592. Two Entertainments at Sudeley. Nichols iii, 137 seq.
- 1590-95. A Woman in the Moon, at court. Lyly.
- 1597 (?) (Before 1631). Amphrisa, the forsaken shepherdess. Heywood.
- Before 1598. Some play by Henslow's company with two shepherds in it.
- 1599. A Pastoral Tragedy, public. Chapman.
- 1599. The Arcadian virgin, public. Chettle and Haughton.

²⁰ Cf. *Cronicle of Drama*, vol. ii, p. 344; and vol. ii, p. 14.

1599. As You Like It, public. Shakspeare.

1597-99. Revival of Love's Metamorphosis and probably other of Lyly's plays.

In or before 1600. Maid's Metamorphosis, public. Anonymous.

1600-1. A Dialogue between two shepherds. Entertainment to the queen. Countess of Pembroke.

1603. A Complaint of Satyrs against Nymphs. Entertainment to Queen Anne. Ben Jonson.

Before 1605. Mucedorus, with the mask of shepherds.

Before 1606. *Pastor Fido*, performed at Cambridge University. Nichols. *Progresses of James I*, vol. i, p. 553.

This list is enough to convince one that the pastoral had wide vogue as a dramatic form. From 1573 on, it played a part in pageants; and from 1580 on, it played a part on the London stage. In London it was represented by at least three companies, the Paul's boys and their successors, Henslow's company and Shakspeare's. Indeed, we can hardly doubt that if we had the evidence of the other companies which we have of Henslow's, we should have still further proof of the prevalence of the pastoral drama.

One other important fact is brought out by this list, the popularity of the pastoral plays 1597-1600. During this period Lyly's *Love's Metamorphosis*, and probably others of his plays, were revived by the children of the chapel. At Henslow's theatres, there were several pastoral plays, and at the Globe, *As You Like It*.

The pastoral play was, then, certainly common and popular, though not completely developed. Our evidence is, however, sufficient to enable us to define the general type with some exactness.

The scene is in Arcadia, sometimes explicitly stated as in *Gallathea* and *Love's Metamorphosis* and sometimes only implied. In all cases, however, the action takes place in a forest and its environs. Shepherds and sometimes shepherdesses appear as inhabitants of this Arcadia; sometimes these are of Arcadian origin, sometimes as in *Maid's Metamorphosis* and *As You Like It*, people of the court also appear in shepherd's guise. Foresters, usually in rivalry

with the shepherds, nymphs, magicians, and various gods and goddesses also appear among the dramatis personae.

The main story of the pastoral portion of the play is always one of unrequited love. The importunate suitor and the cruel or indifferent maid appear over and again. Sometimes the complication of love affairs results, as in *Galathea* and *As You Like It*, in something like the love-chain of the later pastoral.

The chastity motive is rarely absent. The chastity of maids in resisting the overtures of amorous gods, the rejection of lovers because of a preference for the virgin state, the divine nature of this virginity—these are favorite subjects.

Among the scenes and situations used we have found hunting scenes, echo dialogues, song contests, rival discussions of a hunter's and a shepherd's lives; writing verses on a tree, the celebration of a festival by the nymphs, the proposed sacrifice of a virgin, the transformation of a maiden to a tree, most of which have been used more than once in the plays discussed. In these scenes, then, the pastoral drama of Daniel and Fletcher was surely forestalled in the use of much of its material.

The satyr appears only once in the plays and is then a merry fellow, Juculo, not far removed from the faun-like satyr of the entertainments. The motive of crude, ungoverned lust hardly appears at all except in the pursuer of Fidelias in *Love's Metamorphosis* and in the amours of the gods.

This pastoral drama is interwoven with a sort of mythological spectacle. Many of the mythological scenes as the transformation scenes, the embassy to an oracle, and the presence of Diana, Pan, Apollo, and nymphs, are closely connected with the pastoral scenes. In general, however, anything from classical mythology seems to have been thought a fit companion for the pastoral. On the other hand, contemporary satire and bits of native comedy, were often introduced into the Utopian Arcadia.

So much for the characteristics of the pastoral drama before 1605; that it owed much to the Italian drama cannot be doubted, but the exact nature of its indebtedness is a question I cannot pretend to discuss. It was also directly influenced by the non-dramatic English pastorals. The influence of the *Shepherd's Calendar*, the *Faery Queen*, and Lodge's *Rosalynde*

have been noted; and Sidney's *Arcadia* doubtless served to increase the vogue of the dramatic pastoral. That the influence of the Italian drama was equally direct is possible enough; but as in the entertainments, so in the plays, there is no sure evidence of a use of *Aminta* or *Pasto Fido*.

The inter-influence of the entertainments and stage-plays can hardly be determined from the meagre evidence we have, but taking the two together, there is certainly evidence of a direct dramatic influence on Daniel and Fletcher. Even before their time, Chettle and Haughton, Henslow's hacks, must have gone to work to compose their *Arcadian Virgin* on lines already definitely laid down by theatrical precedent. In 1599, too, when Shakespeare dramatized Lodge's novel, he must have been conscious of preparing for the stage material, already familiar there in the work of other dramatists. Surely when Daniel prepared his pastoral, he can hardly have seemed wholly an innovator; and when Fletcher brought out his *Faithful Shepherdess* on the London stage, he was only presenting in a more elaborate form a dramatic genre already well naturalized.

ASHLEY H. THORNDIKE.

Western Reserve University.

PHONETICS AND FRENCH LITERATURE.

I.

- A. *A Manual of Elementary Phonetics*, by A. W. BURT. Toronto: The Copp, Clark Co., Limited, 1898. 8vo, pp. v+93.
 - B. *Le siège de Paris: impressions et souvenirs* par Francisque Sarcey. Edited with introduction and notes, by I. H. B. SPIERS. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1898. 8vo, pp. v+188.
 - C. *Voltaire's Prose*. Extracts selected and edited with introduction and notes, by ADOLPHE COHN and B. D. WOODWARD. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1897. 8vo, pp. xxv+454.
 - D. *La question d'argent*, comédie en cinq actes par Alexandre Dumas, fils. Edited with introduction and notes, by GEORGE N. HENNING. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1898. 8vo, pp. xiii+136.
- A. THE title of Mr. Burt's work, *Elementary Phonetics*, is misleading. It would imply a

publication somewhat similar to Beyer's *Französische Phonetik*, only more elementary; whereas the best and longest part of the work deals with mistakes in the pronunciation of English, phonetic descriptions of the various vocal organs being used to explain how the correct sound is made, and how mistakes can be avoided. About eight pages are devoted to the description of the human vocal organs, and to the classification of sounds, and these eight pages, which alone deal with phonetics proper, are decidedly the weakest of all. Over forty pages are devoted to the separate sounds in English, and to explanations of mistakes and of the means of correcting these errors. This part of the work is good. Finally, some thirty pages are taken up with phonetic transcriptions.

The present criticism will deal mainly with the first eight pages or so. Mr. Burt prepares the reader for this weakness in the description of the vocal organs: he writes, in his preface, that he

"felt that his knowledge of the more scientific side of the subject was scarcely definite or accurate enough to ensure its satisfactory accomplishment."

The assistance of a friend, be he ever so efficient, will never wholly make up for any weakness in the author's own knowledge, but, by his frank admission, Mr. Burt has disarmed adverse criticism, though attention must be called to some mistakes of his.

In the plate on page i, the term "œsophagus," instead of "gullet," had better be used, so as to correspond with the description on p. 4; the glottis is not well represented, since it is supposed to be seen sideways, and the front part of the cricoid cartilage is too low to correspond with the posterior part. In the first Fig. 1 of p. ii, the vocal chords are not well represented as bands. In the second Fig. 1 on p. ii, there should be no "rings" round the windpipe, as the posterior part of the windpipe is membranous. In the second Fig. 2 the vocal chords are not very accurately drawn. In Fig. 4 the points of attachment of the vocal chords are placed too low on the thyroid cartilage. And is the epiglottis actually "attached" to the point indicated on this cartilage?

At the top of p. 4 attention is called to the

necessity of breathing "so that the action of the lungs may be felt chiefly in the region of the abdomen and lower ribs," but no mention is made of the parts involved in such breathing. It would, therefore, be better to explain here the functions of the diaphragm. In the second paragraph of p. 4, it is wrong to state that the glottis is "in the middle" of the vocal chords. A few lines below "sound" is an unfortunate word to use for what is produced when the vocal chords are drawn together and vibrate; "sound" is too general a term. Toward the bottom of this page it would be more accurate to say that "the epiglottis has no direct function in" English "speech," or "in the speech" of most races of men. On p. 5, l. 9, "induces the quality called nasality" had better be "induces nasality" or produces nasalization." Nasality and nasalization are both caused by the passage of air through the nose, and these are two terms which should be made to express separate qualities. Is it helpful to state that the soft palate is "somewhat like an upper tongue reversed," and that the uvula "moves up and down and vibrates" in a manner "corresponding to the tongue tip?" The expression "organ of articulation," as applied to the soft palate, would be most confusing to a beginner, might even be misleading.

The chapter on "classification of speech sounds" is unfortunately worded. The author begins by saying that as "speech sounds depend upon the degree and the place of the obstruction of the breath-stream, we have two chief bases of the classification." We thus have two main classes of sounds depending on the degree of obstruction: consonants and vowels. "The classes of consonants depending upon the second basis, that is, the place of obstruction," Mr. Burt continues, "are distinguished by the name of the speech organ, or organs, mainly engaged in their articulation." He then proceeds: "Another classification of consonants depends upon whether there is a complete closure or merely a narrowing of the breath passage,"—stops and continuants. This second classification of the consonants really infringes on the classification of sounds into consonants and vowels. This produces a confusion which is somewhat unfortunate, and which might be avoided by not using

the degree of obstruction as the basis for the division of sounds into consonants and vowels, since there is no actual "obstruction" in the production of vowels. While the present classification would be intelligible to an experienced phonetician, it must tend to bewilder the beginner.

The introduction of the tongue into the classification on p. 6 is also confusing. If the "tongue" is the principal articulating organ for *t*, *d*, etc., why should it not be for *k*, *g*, etc., also? Or if the "soft-palate" is the "principal organ engaged in the articulation" of *k*, *g*, why should not the alveolars be the principal organs for *t*, *d*? The explanation of voice is found on p. 7, when it should have been given on p. 4, in connection with the function of the vocal organs. The following sentence, on p. 8, had better be worded differently: "change in length is almost invariably accompanied by a difference in the degree of tension of the speech organs." This statement is correct enough for English and kindred languages, but is not quite true if applied in a general way. This sentence might read, "change in length may be accompanied," etc. The following statement, on p. 9, is open to objection:

"Absolute pitch seems to depend upon the reverberation of the sound in the resonance chamber formed between the place of articulation and the outer opening of the mouth."

The rear chamber must also be taken into consideration.

From the ninth page on, the author is at his best, and his description of various mistakes of pronunciation is useful; but, as stated above, such discussions do not come under the domain of phonetics, as scientifically understood. Phonetic phraseology is employed in calling attention to these common mispronunciations, but such use of this phraseology scarcely warrants the book's title—*Elementary Phonetics*.

On p. 17 *r* is said to induce the loss of the "front vanishing sounds" of *ij*, *ei*, *ou*, *uw*; on p. 18 the statement is made that *r* changes *i*: into *ij*, *o*: into *ou*, *u*: into *uw*. These statements seem contradictory. In the sixth paragraph of p. 18 "to omit a vowel" might be better than "to omit a syllable." On p. 25 read "the inherent pitch of vowels" instead of "the pitch of vowels," as any musician,

without the aid of "acoustical instruments," can tell the musical pitch, what is ordinarily called simply the pitch, of vowels.

In the last chapter, on "laws of expression and phonetic syntax," phonetics and rules for correct expression are somewhat mixed, not however in any disagreeable manner, but sufficiently to make this work one on correct pronunciation and expression rather than one on elementary phonetics. The remarks in this chapter are carefully made, and the comparison between the various English speeches—pure English, Canadian English, American English, etc., will prove useful to the reader. These comparisons are also numerous in the middle part of this work, in the chapters on the articulation of consonants and vowels.

This publication closes with nine selections in phonetic script, which seem to be carefully prepared. There is a "general index of words spelt phonetically in part i."

With the exception then of the first part, which treats of the science of phonetics, this work will prove attractive to its readers, and useful to those who will take the trouble to study it as it deserves. Being so full of phonetic expressions and spellings, it may also be useful in inducing its readers to examine for themselves, and scientifically, that branch of investigation which is commonly called "phonetics." Judged as a work on elementary phonetics, it may not be a complete success, but judged, in spite of its title, from a more just standpoint, it is a publication of decided merit.

B. Francisque Sarcey's description of the siege of Paris, and of the life in that city both before and during the siege, is most interesting and, as the editor says, is "particularly adapted to supply . . . the increasing demand . . . for reading matter in the modern languages that shall not be fiction." This "increasing demand" is not supposed to mean that fiction should be entirely eliminated from Preparatory Schools, but that the texts read should not be altogether confined to fiction. The editor has abridged the original text and has accomplished this rather difficult task with success.

Mr. Spiers' plan of collecting "all the brief comment's of persons and places in a separate alphabetical list at the end of the volume where they can be readily referred to at any time,"

is excellent and could be followed with advantage by other editors. As a result of this plan the notes contain, beside "helps on points of language," only the "explanations of historical matter not connected with any one person or place."

Another point that might be mentioned here is the publishers' plan, used in all the texts of this firm, of indicating by numbers, in the text itself, the forms which are explained in the notes. If a student *knows* that a word is explained in the notes he will examine this explanation; otherwise unless more painstaking than the average pupil, he may miss some important explanation. This plan evidently could be followed only in those texts where the notes are comparatively few in number.

Two maps are given: one of northern France, the other of Paris and its surroundings. Both should mention the relative size of the plan, so that students may be enabled to judge of the distance between various places. In the map of Paris an explanation might be given of what the shaded portion represents.

P. 12, 11: an explanation of the formation of *morblots* might be given. P. 27, 4: the word *humus* might be explained, and also the expression *il ne sentait de guère* (p. 43, 16), as well as *boréenne* in the compound *hyperboréenne* (p. 118, 6), *gaver* (p. 123, 20), and *astiquage* (p. 127, 29). A note on the *Hôtel de Ville* (p. 152, 17) would not be amiss. It may be better to explain too few than too many forms, but as the editor is preparing this text for comparative beginners, those words might be explained which are not found in the average small dictionary.

As to the notes, have not the English the same expression as the French *brûler ses vaisseaux* (p. 3, 1)? P. 6, 1: is this English rendering the most accurate? P. 14, 5: this note is not necessary. P. 52, 3: has not "fire-eater" a somewhat different, more vehement, meaning than *un brave à trois poils*? P. 62, 1: "Coryza" is an English as well as a French term. P. 73, 1: had the word "weather" better be introduced into this translation? It would not be used in rendering into English, even literally, the expressions *faire du vent*, *faire du soleil*, etc. P. 101, 1: "Green-room"

¹ The printer's errors have been noted by the publishers.

is not the only rendering of *foyer*, and may not perhaps be the best here. P. 110, 1: might not "dog" be better here than "horse"? P. 115, 2: *écoles* means "schoolings," or "lessons," rather than "blunders;" at least, the former translations seem to be nearer the original. P. 134, 2: is "barge" ever used in America to mean *tapissière*? P. 143, 1: does the "saloon-keeper" represent a French institution? Would it be a good rendering of *marchand de vins*?

Mr. Spiers' notes are carefully prepared and his edition of *Le Siège de Paris* deserves a place in the curriculum of the schools and colleges of America.

C. The review of this edition of Voltaire's prose must needs be brief, on account of the very excellence of this work and of its acceptability to instructors in charge of advanced classes. The introduction is an ideal one for students, and the notes, few of which are grammatical or syntactical, give all the information necessary to the full appreciation of the work of such a versatile writer as Voltaire. The only suggestion possible seems to be that Mr. Spiers' plan, carried out in his edition of *Le Siège de Paris*, had better have been followed. In other words, an alphabetical list of persons and places would be more convenient than the scattered remarks contained in the notes. This plan of Mr. Spiers' deserves the consideration of editors of advanced texts, especially when reference to men and places is frequent, and when such reference is of importance to the proper understanding of the subject-matter.

The editors do not consider Voltaire so much a literary man, as a man whose influence is felt in the "facts and relations of life." They have, therefore,

"endeavored to select extracts that will enable the reader to understand what Voltaire achieved. Their purpose has not been purely, nor even mainly, literary."

Owing to Voltaire's immense correspondence, only a few of his letters have been given in the present edition, but the editors propose issuing an additional volume of *Extracts from Voltaire*, chosen altogether from his *Correspondance*, and the excellence of their work induces Modern Language instructors to hope that their good intentions may soon materialize.

D. One of the best of the recently edited

French texts in America is Mr. Henning's *La question d'argent*, by Alexandre Dumas, fils. The introduction, covering some eight pages, is exactly what is needed by the average American student. If introductions can be divided into two classes, the stimulating and the exhaustive (too frequently the exhausting), then Mr. Henning's would be classed among the former. All the minute facts of the author's life, all the dates and particulars so dear to a certain set of annotators, are conspicuous by their absence in this editor's introduction, and instead are found a few pages of matter which touch on the various social and literary influences in Dumas' life in such wise as to prove a veritable stimulant to the student's mind, inducing in it a desire for a further acquaintance with the life and writings of this clever "dramatist and moralist." The play itself is well adapted to class-room work, and will prove interesting to second and third-year students. The notes are as well prepared as is the introduction, and form the close of a publication which must be acknowledged much more satisfactory than are a number of recent texts.

A statement of the mutual relation of the different characters, on p. xvi. would prove helpful. There are very few misprints in the text. Read *avez* for *avec* (p. 8, 10). It might, perhaps be well to explain in a note the *ç*, on p. 18, 28. The rather peculiar use of *beaucoup* on p. 19, 4 might be noted. *Si* (p. 61, 4) had better be explained. The possible criticisms on the notes are not many, and are nearly all unimportant. The wording of the notes on pp. 9, 2 and 74, 2 might be changed, as the average student would hardly understand how *que* could "repeat" *comme* or *si*. There is a hidden meaning in *d'une grande richesse* (p. 13, 1) which could be brought out in the note. The term *écu* (p. 18, 2) is so often used to denote a five-franc piece, that it is hardly correct to say that it "commonly" today equals three francs. *Qui* (p. 22, 3) used for "what" is an old rather than an "unusual" construction; at least, it was used formerly more frequently than it is now. "It's a set price" (p. 71, 1) hardly contains the full meaning of *c'est un prix fait comme pour les petits pâtés*; in such a rendering the sarcastic turn given by *comme pour les petits pâtés* is entirely omitted. If *qu'il* (p. 87, 4) were meant for *qui*, as the note states, Mathilda would have called attention to this misspelled form, as she does with *scélérat* and *salut*, and *qu'il* would have been spelled correctly in the text, as are the above words. *Qu'il* must, therefore, represent *que+il*, used here ungrammatically. This *que* probably depends on *écrivez*, a more correct French construction requiring the subjunctive *donne* instead of the future *donnera*; the meaning would thus be *demandez à M. Jules de vous en donner*, or *écrivez-lui pour qu'il vous en*

donne. Another possibility is that *que* is here used instead of *car*. *Feux de Bengale* (p. 90, 1) are not always "blue" lights. A note (p. 95, 1) on the use of *huit jours*, *quinze jours*, *une quinzaine*, might not be superfluous. It should be stated that *qui* (p. 106, 3) is more indefinite than *celui qui*, thus corresponding rather to *quiconque*.

Such are the criticisms of a text which, except for these minor faults, is unusually satisfactory.

EDWIN S. LEWIS.

Princeton University.

ENGLISH LITERATURE.

Leaves from the [Golden Legend] Chosen by H. D. MADGE, LL.M. / With Illustrations by / H. M. WATTS. Westminster: Archibald Constable & Co., 1898. xvii-286 pp.

THIS dainty little volume is confessedly intended only to satisfy the idle and "short-minded" curiosity of the general reader. It is an effort to popularize some of the more interesting stories in the *Legenda Aurea*, and the work, from this point of view, is very well done. The (ten) full-page illustrations are pleasing. The typography of the volume is clear and correct, with here and there a slip. The selections are judicious. Indeed, one can hardly go astray in selecting stories from the *Legenda*, the paths are too well marked out. Hence we are not surprised to find Mr. Madge giving us *Barlaam and Josaphat*, *St. Brandon*, *St. Eustace*, *Sts. George and Alban* (being an Englishman), *Seven Sleepers*, *St. Ursula*, *Holy Cross*, etc., including nearly all the better known and more interesting legends. There are forty-four chapters in all; and Mr. Madge has had the good sense to give, in the case of really interesting stories, the complete version. But in some cases he gives only a fragment, in many only a detached miracle. In this connection we may state that it seems to us he makes an error in fusing into one chapter stories from widely separated legends, and without indicating in any way their sources; for example, in chapter forty-two, p. 361 (*Purgatory and the Dead*), the first three tales (only separated as paragraphs in the text) are from *All Souls* (Graesse's Latin ed., pp. 731-733), while the fourth is from *St. Lawrence* (*Ib.* p. 494) and in cap. 44, p. 267 (*Of Some Possessed with Devils*), the first is from *St. Ambrose* (*Ib.* p. 252), the second from *St. Elizabeth* (p. 766), the third from *St. Peter Mart.* (p. 289), and the last from *St. Dominic* (p. 475).

The text of Caxton, or Wynkyn de Worde, is used, but modernized both in spelling and vocabulary. The general character of the changes may be seen in a few lines (p. 263-4):

"And this judge took away by force three houses that were longing to the church of Saint Lawrence, and a garden of Saint Agnes, and possessed them wrongfully"=(Kelmscott ed., p. 715).

"And this judge tooke aweye by force thre howses that were longyng to the chirche of saynt laurence, and a gardyn of saynt Agnes, and possessed them wrongfully."

A goodly portion of the *Introduction*, which contains ten pages, is devoted to the life of Voragine and to a discussion of the scope of his work and its popularity, etc. On p. x we find:

"Caxton's edition [of the *Golden Legend*] with its four hundred and fourty-eight chapters is the largest, but the French version which he followed (Paris, 1480) is not far off with 440."

This is surely a *lapsus*; Caxton has two hundred and fifty chapters, and a corresponding reduction should be made in the number assigned to de Vignay. Mr. Madge is, perhaps, excusable for counting Jean Belet's so-called *Légende des saints dorés* as a "rendering" of the *Legenda*; it is really very different, as he might have learned from the notice of MS. Add. 17, 275, Brit. Mus. He is acquainted with the English prose version in Egert. MS. 876; whether he knows the other MSS. we can only guess; but he certainly was not familiar with MS. Add. 11, 565 and its incorporated English saints, since *St. Alban* and *St. Katherine* (see pp. xiv, 270, and 282) are the only ones which he thinks Caxton got from his "englysshe legende." The *Notes* (pp. 270-286) are useful and amply sufficient for their purpose, with enough learning to justify them, and enough interest to leaven the learning. The most pretentious are those on *Barlaam* (based chiefly on Zotenberg and Jacobs), *Brendon* (Wright, Zimmer, Whitley, Stokes, etc.), and *Patrick*. It is unfortunate that, in the latter, the note is far longer than the text, which is a short portion of Caxton's short legend, when he might have given us the real Purgatory story as found in the English MSS.

The book is reviewed in the *Academy*, Oct. 22, 1898.

PIERCE BUTLER.

Johns Hopkins University.

CORRESPONDENCE.

AN INTERPOLATION IN THE TOWNELEY ABRAHAM PLAY.

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES,

SIRS:—Among the various English Mysteries on the subject of Abraham's Sacrifice, the Broome, Towneley, and Dublin [Northampton] plays are in one respect peculiar:

Deus reveals the divine purpose in the trial of Abraham. The plays, however, do not agree in representing the Godhead as impelled by the same motive.

That the monologue of 'Deus,' original in the other two, was an interpolation in the Towneley, play has been recognized before (Davidson, *English Mystery Plays*, p. 130), but its source has never, I believe, been pointed out.

The Towneley play of Abraham is written in an eight line stanza, with alternate rimes. This metrical structure is broken by the seventh stanza, which is composed of couplets riming aa bb cc dd.

Deus. "I will help adam and his kynde,
Might I luf and lewte fynd;
Wold thay to me be trew, and blyn
Of thare pride and of thare syn:
My seruand I will found and frast,
Abraham, if he be trast;
On certan wise I will hym proue,
If he to me be trew of louf."

What seems to be the source of this interpolation is found in *Le Mistère du Viel Testament*, ll. 9511-9515:

Dieu. "Il sera fait
Pour monstree le vouloir parfait
Que j'ay des humains rapeller
De ce lieu en ten bres fait,
Ou Adam, par son grant forfait,
Fait tous ses enfans devaller."

Brotanek (*Anglia* xxi, 21 ff.) has recently shown with much probability that the source of the Dublin play was a French version of the Abraham story, more closely resembling the Paris Lyons recension (E.F.) than that of the *Viel Testament*. However true this may be of the Dublin play, and of the original form of the other English mystery plays on the subject, the reviser of the Towneley must have been acquainted with a similar, if not identical, redaction as that given by the *Viel Testament* (A.B.C.), for E.F. omits that portion of the *Procès de Paradis* comprised between ll. 9435-9515. Since Towneley (7) is apparently the only place in the English mysteries, on the subject of Abraham's Sacrifice when the *Procès de Paradis* is evidently a source, it is clear that the French version used by the Towneley reviser must have been different from that used by the original author.

Except in the Broome and Dublin plays no reference to Adam's Fall is found in any of the other Abraham mysteries—and in both these the references are little more than a recapitulation of biblical history sufficient to mark the condition of affairs at the beginning of the action. But the Towneley mentions Adam in two additional places. In Abraham's monologue two entire stanzas are devoted to Adam, and in l. 61 his name recurs. It may have been this dwelling on the theme that prompted the interpolation.

JULIAN HUGENIN.

Johns Hopkins University.